

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1957

(Legislative day of Monday, February 18, 1957)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. D. Payne, Protestant chaplain, House of God, Mooseheart, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Across the paths of the long yesterdays Thou didst guide our fathers to their promised lands. Thou didst inspire those hardy pioneers of ours, who pushed back the western frontiers and laid across America the foundations upon which was built the superstructure of our civilization.

We, their sons, pray to Thee to lead us in this perplexing, baffling hour of our sojourn on earth. May we have the courage to build bravely the empire of love among the children of men. Give unto us the unshakable faith of those who know that their times are in Thy hand. So often we have forgotten that every good and perfect gift comes from Thy bounty.

Even in the valley of the shadow, when we have fought down our fears and met our defeats, we have learned how much better it is to walk with Thee in the dark than to walk alone in the light.

We pray for those this day who are discouraged, disappointed, disillusioned. Release those who live in habit prisons builded by their own hands, and give them a new freedom.

We implore Thee to cover all men everywhere with Thy forgiving love. We ask this for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 18, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 11, 1957, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 637) to amend the Small Business Act of 1953 to increase the amount available thereunder for business loans.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676) relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 348) to amend section 12 of the act approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), relating to the admission into the Union of the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington, by providing for the use of public lands granted to the States therein for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishings, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said States, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING
SENATE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Public Buildings Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today; and I also ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today; and I call the attention of the minority leader to the fact that two subcommittees—the Internal Security Subcommittee and the Public Buildings Subcommittee—wish to sit during today's session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by authority of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which are holding joint hearings on the oil lift to Europe, I ask unanimous consent that the two subcommittees, meeting jointly, may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has conferred with the majority and minority leaders, and the request is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The request is that the two subcommittees named by the Senator from Wyoming be per-

mitted to meet during sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow. The Senator from Wyoming has conferred with the majority and minority leaders. Witnesses are in attendance, ready to appear before the subcommittees, and the Senator from Wyoming would like to continue the sessions of the subcommittees.

Mr. LONG. Is this request made on behalf of the Internal Security Subcommittee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. It is made on behalf of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Wormser, and several other officials are present and ready to testify.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming has spoken to me. I have no objection to the request so far as it relates to today. I would prefer that the request be made on a daily basis. I understood that it was only for today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will be glad to modify my request accordingly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That was my understanding of what the request was to be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming, as modified? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL
TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FORTHCOMING VISITS OF THE
PRIME MINISTER OF FRANCE AND
THE PRESIDENT OF THE FEDERAL
REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement, if my colleagues will indulge me:

It has been agreed that we should announce, and I now do so with great pleasure, that on February 27, at 3:30 p. m., the Senate will be addressed by the Prime Minister of France, the Honorable Guy Mollet.

On March 7, there will be in the Hall of the House of Representatives, a joint meeting of the House of Representatives and the Senate, at which time we shall receive President Heuss, of the Federal Republic of Germany.

I make this announcement for the information of all Members of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE
BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, during which Senators may present petitions

and memorials, introduce bills, and transact other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORTS ON OVEROBLIGATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of overobligations of appropriations in that Department (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation of an appropriation under "Repair, improvement and equipment of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

FURNISHING SUPPLIES AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

UNIFORM ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN PERSONS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a regular component of an armed force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress of liquidation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, dated December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ESTATE OF HIGA KENSAT

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of the estate of Higa Kensat (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF PERFORMANCE RATING ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 (b) of the Performance Rating Act of 1950, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Long Beach, Calif., Council of Republican Women, Federated, relating to a reduction of the national budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution relating to the Army and Air National Guard

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in the Reserve Forces Act of 1955 deemed it wise to increase the preparedness of our country for national defense by ordering all the Reserve Forces, including the National Guard to take not less than 3 nor more than 6 months' basic training, and the Army National Guard has repeatedly requested the Secretary of Defense to implement an accelerated 3-month basic training program as well as a 6-month program to enable young men who wish to continue their education to obtain this training without sacrificing a semester from their educational program, and the Secretary of Defense has, since the passage of that act, and continues to refuse implementing such program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas (the Senate concurring therein), That we call upon the Kansas delegation in Congress to take every action which may be necessary to bring about implementation of an accelerated 3-month basic training as an alternate to the 6-month program now in effect for those members of the Army and Air National Guard who wish to take advantage of same in order to continue their education without interruption; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is authorized and directed to send an enrolled copy of this resolution to each Member of the Kansas delegation in the Congress.

"I hereby certify that the above concurrent resolution originated in the House, and was adopted by that body February 4, 1957.

"JESS TAYLOR,

"Speaker of the House.

"A. E. ANDERSEN,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Adopted by the senate February 12, 1957.

"JOSEPH W. HINKLE, Sr.,

"President of the Senate.

"RALPH E. KARKER,

"Assistant Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. CURTIS:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Legislative Resolution 7

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska has attained the unprecedented peacetime strength of 3,522 officers, warrant officers, and men; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska is organized into 45 units located in 30 communities of this great State; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska is under the Constitution of the United States a State force under the command of the Governor and becomes a Federal force only when called or ordered into active Federal service; and

"Whereas the Department of the Army and the Department of Defense of the Government of the United States have repeatedly attempted to degrade and deemphasize the achievements of the Army National Guard in organizing units, recruiting personnel, maintaining Army equipment, and in training; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Army has advised the President of the United States that the National Guard is 83 percent untrained notwithstanding the fact that the results of the continental Army command tests conducted last summer proved the opposite to be true; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Department of the Army of the Government of the United

States has directed that all nonprior service enlistees of the Army National Guard of this State be required to undergo a period of 6 months' active duty training with the United States Army as a condition to their enlistment; and

"Whereas this requirement is unreasonable, unrealistic, unnecessary, exceedingly detrimental to the Army National Guard of the State of Nebraska, and in excess of the minimums specified by the Reserve Forces Act of 1955; and

"Whereas a similar requirement applied to the Army Reserve has failed materially to attract any significant number of young men into the Army Reserve despite herculean efforts by the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army and the expenditure of millions of dollars in an effort to overcome opposition thereto; and

"Whereas adequate basic training can be provided in a period of 3 months; and

"Whereas the Army National Guard recognizes the need for a 3-month period of basic training and would accept such a period as a prerequisite to the enlistment of nonprior service enlistees; and

"Whereas a 3-month active duty basic training program as a condition of enlistment in the Army National Guard would encounter little if any opposition from industry, educators, religious groups, and the parents and the young men of the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 68th session assembled—

"1. That the State of Nebraska views with alarm and disapproval the unwarranted action of the Secretary of the Army of the Government of the United States, and urges its Representatives in the Congress of the United States to seek legislative action which will provide a realistic program of active duty basic training to be established for the Army National Guard.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNLEY,

"President of the Legislature.

"I, Hugo F. Srb, hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Legislative Resolution 7, which was passed by the Legislature of Nebraska in 68th regular session on the 7th day of February 1957.

"HUGO F. SRB,

"Clerk of the Legislature."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS—RESOLUTION OF MONTANA SENATE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Memorial No. 2 adopted by the Montana Senate on February 12. The memorial deals with the need for adjustment of acreage allotments between soft, low quality wheats, which are in surplus, and wheats of high milling quality which are in demand.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the

rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate memorial to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Secretary Ezra Taft Benson, Montana's Congressional delegation, and members of the United States House and Senate Committees on Agriculture, seeking an adjustment in the Federal farm program as it relates to the grower of quality wheat.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

Whereas all wheat acreage allotments and marketing quotas were meant to control surpluses, but there is no surplus of the kind of wheat raised in Montana;

Whereas millers are again asking for more high milling quality wheat of which Montana is the principal producer;

Whereas Montana growers are still subject to the same restrictions as are growers of soft, low quality wheats, which are said to be in surplus;

Whereas huge drought areas have cut production levels and greater export demand for wheat appears certain;

Whereas some higher acreage allotments for our small operators will tend to redress a balance which is badly needed and the present pressure on all operators is curtailing too much production of high protein wheat: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by Montana's Senate in 1957 session assembled, That all officials noted above be asked to see that revisions are made in the Federal farm program to permit increased production in areas which grow wheat of high milling quality: Now, therefore, be it further

Resolved, That this senate memorial be read in full and spread on the minutes of the Senate Journal.

PAUL CANNON,
President of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution DD adopted by the North Dakota Legislature expressing its concern regarding the serious illness of our esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and their best wishes for his speedy recovery.

Mr. President, the sentiments expressed in this most appropriate resolution are shared I am sure by all the Members of the United States Senate. We hope and pray that he soon recover.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution DD

Concurrent resolution wishing United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER a speedy recovery from his current illness

Whereas the senior Senator from North Dakota has recently been stricken with pneumonia and pleurisy and is reported to be seriously ill; and

Whereas the senior Senator has spent the greater part of his life in public office serving the people of North Dakota; and

Whereas during his many years of service to the State of North Dakota, Senator LANGER has always given his faithful and untiring devotion to this State, which has endeared him in the hearts of the people of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives

concurring therein). That the Legislative Assembly and the citizens of the State of North Dakota extend to Senator LANGER their best wishes for the senior Senator's very speedy recovery from his illness; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate forward copies of this resolution to the senior Senator from North Dakota and Mrs. Langer.

CLYDE DUFFY,
President of the senate.
VIC GILBREATH,
Secretary of the senate.
B. F. WOLF,
Speaker of the house.
GERALD L. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the house.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SENATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, Senate Concurrent Resolution P as approved by the 35th Legislative Assembly, State of North Dakota, on Tuesday, the 8th day of January 1957.

This resolution concerns the lack of industry and employment for Indian families on the Turtle Mountain, Fort Totten, and Standing Rock Reservations in North Dakota during the winter months. It requests the Congress to study this situation and by legislation or other means alleviate the difficult situation in which these people find themselves.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution P

Concurrent resolution urging Congress to study and legislate in the field of Indian employment

Whereas there are now approximately 650 employable Indian families receiving general assistance on 3 Indian reservations in North Dakota—Turtle Mountain, Fort Totten, and Standing Rock; and

Whereas there is no employment available nor industry established to enable heads or members of these employable families to work for their living during the winter months in North Dakota; and

Whereas the extension of general assistance to any people, Indian or white, is on an emergency basis because it is relegated to employable people who need assistance because they do not have employment; and

Whereas the passive acceptance of general assistance does not teach work habits and when it is extended over a length of time and for many years in succession it not only does not establish work habits for a good portion of the year, but it can be actually detrimental to the habits of industry that the Indian desires and that society wants for him; and

Whereas the program and planning of the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior, in connection with future industries is commendable and should be increasingly vigorously pushed as time goes on; and

Whereas the basic deficiency of relocation plans in the past is that many Indian families do not desire to leave their homeland, a desire which is understandable to those acquainted with their generation after generation living in the reservation areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the United States Congress is hereby urged and requested to study this vital situation on North Dakota Indian reservations and to implement through legislation or any other means a program that will insure an even more vigorous stepping up of industrial development on or near or adjacent to Indian reservations; and to recognize that vital to future industrial development is the interim establishment of suitable and substantive work projects to be available to unemployed Indians to teach industry and work habits, and that the establishment of work projects be consummated immediately for the hundreds of Indians out of work this winter on the three North Dakota Indian reservations; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the North Dakota Congressional delegation, to the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, to Gov. John E. Davis, and to Mrs. Josephine Kelly.

CLYDE DUFFY,
President of the senate.
VIC GILBREATH,
Secretary of the senate.
B. F. WOLF,
Speaker of the house.
GERALD F. STAIR,
Chief Clerk of the house.

THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF CITY COMMISSIONERS, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution of the Board of City Commissioners of Bismarck, N. Dak., which relates to remarks made by Defense Secretary Charles Wilson relative to the National Guard.

The resolution justly reaffirms the confidence of the Bismarck City Commission in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Bismarck:

Whereas the North Dakota National Guard has served our State and our Nation with distinction and valor over the years in war and in peace; and

Whereas the North Dakota Army and Air National Guard has provided a continuing source of strength and confidence not only to North Dakota but to the entire United States, and as a continuing assurance that the citizenry of North Dakota is mindful and appreciative of the American way of life and the American heritage of freedom, liberty, and justice; and

Whereas the Bismarck City Commission has been presented with a copy of the Bismarck Tribune dated Tuesday, January 29, 1957, wherein on page 1 in an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, D. C., are certain insulting and defamatory remarks attributed to Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, concerning the National Guard; and

Whereas the said edition of the Bismarck Tribune has been called to the attention of the Bismarck City Commission by Lieut. Col. Robert W. Carlson, Commander of North Dakota National Guard's 188th Armored Field Artillery Battalion, in a public appearance at the regular meeting of the Bismarck City Commission on February 5, 1957, at which said appearance Lieutenant Colonel Carlson

termed the remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson as unfounded and insulting and asking that the Bismarck City Commission take cognizance of the insulting remarks attributed to Secretary of Defense Wilson: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bismarck City Commission at its regular meeting on February 5, 1957, does reaffirm its deep pride in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard for their services to our State and to our Nation in all of the wars of the United States and in all emergencies arising within the State of North Dakota; and be it further

Resolved, That the Bismarck City Commission does recognize the North Dakota National Guard as a continuing source of strength in which the citizens of Bismarck and all North Dakota take deep pride and recognize that the North Dakota National Guard is a source of strength upon which our beloved country can rely in all emergencies and disasters; be it further

Resolved, That the Bismarck City Commission does reaffirm its confidence in the men and officers of the North Dakota National Guard and their intelligence, character, valor, patriotism, and devotion to the United States of America and its way of life; be it further

Resolved, That the remarks of Secretary of Defense Wilson having been called to our attention as quoted in the Bismarck Tribune of January 29, 1957, reflecting discreditably upon our distinguished and brave fellow North Dakotans who have served and are serving in the National Guard, we do request with all our vigor that Secretary of Defense Wilson issue a complete retraction of the remarks attributed to him in aforesaid statement and an apology to the North Dakota National Guard, its men and officers; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, United States President; the Honorable William Langer, United States Senator; the Honorable Milton Young, United States Senator; the Honorable John E. Davis, Governor and commander in chief of the North Dakota National Guard; and Maj. Gen. Heber L. Edwards, North Dakota adjutant general.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Burleigh,
City of Bismarck, ss:

I, Tom Baker, the duly appointed, qualified and acting city auditor of the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the original resolution of the board of city commissioners of said city adopted at a regular meeting held on February 5, 1957.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and the seal of the city of Bismarck, N. Dak., this 14th day of February 1957.

[SEAL]

TOM BAKER,
City Auditor.

THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in view of public attention given recently to the remarks of the Secretary of Defense relative to the importance of the National Guard, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Missouri House of Representatives in tribute to the contribution of this great organization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule,

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been stated by a high official of the Federal Government that the National Guard has provided a means of evading active service in the Armed Forces; and

Whereas there appears to be a reasonable doubt that such a statement is wholly justified; and

Whereas at the outbreak of World War II, units of the National Guard were called to duty and served with distinction on many fronts; and

Whereas the National Guard for many years has had a twofold function, "To provide a Reserve component of the Army of the United States, capable of immediate expansion to war strength able to furnish units fit for services anywhere in the world," and to "provide sufficient organizations in each State so trained and equipped as to enable them to function in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety"; and

Whereas the guard has functioned admirably in the protection of life and property during disasters such as floods, prison riots, droughts, and other emergencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Missouri General Assembly go on record as commending the officers and men of the National Guard for the outstanding service they have rendered in the past; and be it further

Resolved, That despite any reckless statements to the contrary, the National Guard is an excellent organization devoted to duty and representative of the fine young men of the Nation; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be instructed to send copies of this resolution to Maj. Gen. Albert D. Sheppard and to each member of the Missouri delegation in Congress.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce at Hoisington, Kans., the Chamber of Commerce at Ellinwood, Kans., and the St. John, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, urging the Defense Department and other agencies which contract for the production of manufactured goods to give consideration to placing subcontracts in our agricultural areas.

Personally, I cannot stress too strongly the urgency for this relief in many areas where agriculture has been the predominant factor in the economy.

It occurs to me that we should give every consideration to a program of this type for a long-range policy of strengthening the agricultural areas and maintaining a strong economic position in every section of the Nation.

It may be conducive for agencies making these contracts to give them to large concerns in congested areas, but I maintain it is good business in the long run—even though it may cost more—to keep a general distribution of our production in this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee

on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Hoisington, Kans., January 9, 1957.

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas, and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions, it will affect the economic condition of this area for not less than 2 years in the future. And, whereas the oil industry which we have enjoyed for the past many years, is rapidly depleting; and whereas many small machine shops which have been tied in with the oil and agriculture, are finding it impossible to stay in business and that such industries are manned with the very best of mechanical help;

Now, therefore, we, the members of the Hoisington Chamber of Commerce in regular assembled meeting on this 8th day of January 1957, do hereby memorialize our Government to consider a means of assisting such small industries as well as additional industries in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing the necessary machine tools to participate in the many subcontracts which the national defense program is creating, thus furnishing them with the necessary help and information needed to participate in these lettings.

This is one positive way of balancing the economy of this area which is and has been depending entirely on oil and agriculture, and will create part-time employment for many small farmers, who otherwise will have to move off the farm.

Copies of this resolution will be mailed to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, with copies going to Senators Carlson and Schoeppel, Congressman Breeding, and Secretary of Interior Fred Seaton, Secretary of Agriculture Benson, as well as to Governor of Kansas George Docking.

C. H. SMITH,

President, Hoisington Chamber of Commerce.

RAY SMITH,

Chairman, Industrial Committee, and Central Kansas Industrial Development Association.

ELLINWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,

Ellinwood, Kans., February 7, 1957.

The Honorable FRANK CARLSON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON:

Whereas the area comprising the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas, and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that regardless of favorable weather conditions, it will affect the economic condition of this area for not less than 2 years in the future. And whereas the oil industry which we have enjoyed for the past many years is rapidly depleting. And whereas many small machine shops, which have been tied in with the oil and agriculture, are finding it impossible to stay in business and that such industries are manned with the very best of mechanical help;

Now, therefore, we, the members of the Ellinwood Chamber of Commerce in regular assembled meeting on this 7th day of February 1957, do hereby memorialize our Government to consider a means of assisting such small industries as well as additional industries, in financing, leasing, and otherwise securing the necessary machine tools to participate in the many subcontracts which the national defense program is creating, thus furnishing them with the necessary help and information needed to participate in these lettings.

This is one positive way of balancing the economy of this area which is and has been

depending entirely on oil and agriculture, and will create part-time employment for many small farmers, who otherwise will have to move off the farm.

GATL M. DEVORE,
President, Ellinwood Chamber of
Commerce.

O. D. HEDRICK,
Chairman, Industrial Committee.

Whereas the area represented by the Central Kansas Industrial Development Association is in the drought-stricken area of Kansas; and whereas this drought condition is of such serious nature that the economics of the area will be affected adversely for at least 2 years beyond the return of normal moisture conditions; and

Whereas the oil industry, which has contributed so greatly to this area for several years is in a period of decline which seems certain to continue as oil reservoirs are being depleted; and

Whereas many shops and other businesses which have thrived because of direct or secondary connections with the oil industry and agriculture are suffering to the point of elimination; and

Whereas the future welfare of this area is threatened with further damage unless compensating business volume can be developed and obtained to offset the shrinking oil development and agriculture income; and

Whereas this area is blessed with a wealth of talent capable of producing a wide variety of products, including many which are doubtless in demand by the Government through subcontract arrangements; and

Whereas information outlining procedure and other requirements essential in obtaining subcontracts is not generally available in this area; and

Whereas products manufactured in smaller plants by subcontractors, and materials which may be supplied by smaller plants are not generally known in this area: Now, therefore, we the members of the St. John Chamber of Commerce, in a sincere desire to assist the economic welfare of this city, this community and this area by developing of local industry and possibly interesting new industry, hereby appeal to our representatives in Government to furnish us with information as to methods, procedure, tool needs, plant needs, identity of firms and individuals who can assist us, in our effort to help ourselves, our city, our community, our area, our Nation.

We feel that with sufficient and proper information, we will be able to develop our own economy, to the end that part-time employment may be available for farmers whose agricultural income has been cut drastically, to others who need employment and are capable of handling responsible jobs, and finally to produce goods which are held in need by the Government in its program of further self-defense.

We feel that present channels of information are not sufficient in the matters presented above; we will appreciate your sincere consideration and assistance, as suggested.

Copies of this resolution are being sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator Frank Carlson, Senator Andrew Schoepel, Congressman Floyd Breeding, Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton.

Adopted by the St. John Chamber of Commerce, St. John, Kans., February 2, 1957.

WISCONSIN CONTINUES TO OPPOSE CHICAGO WATER DIVERSION— ARTICLE, RESOLUTION, AND TELE- GRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, as reflected on page 1863 of the RECORD, there was authorized to be published as

Senate Document No. 28 a letter from the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, providing information with regard to the effects on the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River, of an increase of 1,000 cubic feet per second in the diversion at Chicago.

This is a subject which I have previously discussed many times on the Senate floor in connection with my continued unalterable opposition to what has come to be known to us, of the Midwest, as the Chicago water steal.

Needless to say, once more the public officials and citizens of my State are up in arms, so to speak, as are officials and citizens of other Lake States, in opposition to Chicago's latest efforts at so-called temporary water diversion.

I have in my hands, for example, the text of an article from the Saturday, February 16, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, indicating the reactions of the able municipal port director of Milwaukee, Harry Brockel, to this engineers' report.

I also have in my hands the text of a few of the many expressions from leading officials of my State on this issue.

For example, on January 24 of this year the Honorable Vernon W. Thomson, Governor of Wisconsin, stated in a letter to me:

I am deeply appreciative of your continued support and concern in our perennial fight to prevent additional water diversion by the Chicago Sanitary District and the State of Illinois.

I also have the text of a resolution adopted by the mayor and common council of the City of Manitowoc, opposing the Chicago effort, together with a message from the chairman of the Board of the Harbor Commissioners of Racine, the Honorable Frederick Young.

I present these various items, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, and be thereafter appropriately referred to the Committee on Public Works.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of February 16, 1957]

BROCKEL SEES CHICAGO GAIN—COMMENTS ON REPORT OF ARMY ON EFFECTS OF WATER DIVERSION

Chicago would gain and other Great Lakes cities and States would lose if Congress allowed the increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet a second of water from Lake Michigan.

That view was expressed Saturday by Harry C. Brockel, municipal port director, in commenting on a report of the Army Corps of Engineers describing the effect both a temporary and permanent increase in diversion at Chicago for sanitary and navigation purposes on the Illinois waterway.

The engineers' report was submitted Friday to Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, in Washington, D. C., by Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, chief of engineers.

DROP IN LEVEL SEEN

The engineers' report, authorized by Congress in 1952, said that the diversion of 1,000 additional cubic feet over a 3-year period would lower Lakes Michigan and Huron five-eighths of an inch. If the extra diversion were permanent, giving Chicago the right to boost its withdrawals from the lake to 2,500

cubic feet a second, the levels of the 2 lakes would drop 1 inch over a 15-year span, the report stated.

Lakes Erie and Ontario would be affected less in either case, the engineers said.

But they pointed out that power production losses to New York State and the province of Ontario would range between \$408,000 and \$918,000 over the 3 years and \$708,000 a year if the permanent diversion were allowed.

POWER GAIN FOR CHICAGO

At the same time the Chicago drainage district's powerplant at Lockport, Ill., would gain additional power valued at \$202,000 over the 3 years, and \$67,000 a year if the diversion were permanent, the report stated.

Economic losses to navigation would be \$240,000 a year to the American fleet on the lakes, the engineers estimated. This would be caused by the fact that ships could carry less cargo.

Brockel said that while the engineers minimized the economic losses due to increased diversion, there still was a great danger that once Chicago obtained the additional 1,000 feet it would seek more.

Many bills have been introduced in Congress to authorize the additional conversion.

Whereas the city of Manitowoc is faced with a serious problem in the request of the Chicago Sanitary District for a large increase in water diversion to alleviate low water in the Mississippi River; and

Whereas this question has been before Congress on various occasions wherein it was resolved that such diversion can only present serious problems to navigation on the Great Lakes, and particularly the port cities bordering on said lakes; and

Whereas the citizens of the city of Manitowoc depend on the Great Lakes and its port for a large share of its marine traffic and business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council, That we oppose any further diversion of the water from the Great Lakes to be used by the Chicago Sanitary District; be it further

Resolved by the mayor and Common Council, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, the attorney general of Wisconsin, to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY, to Congressman JOHN BYRNES, and to the Great Lakes Harbor Association.

RACINE, WIS.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

May we again bring to your attention the political plans of Chicago and Illinois to drain the Great Lakes and use to their personal gain possibly challenging the worth of our channel uses the depth of our harbors, and urge that you use every facility at your disposal and do not allow this continual scandalous endeavor to course away our God-given gifts which Milwaukee and Wisconsin have fought for through the years and which we should not lose now.

F. M. YOUNG,
Chairman, Harbor Commission, City
of Racine.

INDEPENDENCE RESOLUTION BY LITHUANIAN-AMERICANS OF RA- CINE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I was pleased to receive today from Stanley P. Budrys, secretary of the Lithuanian-American Council of Racine, a resolution which was adopted at a mass meeting of American citizens of Lithuanian descent in the city of Racine, Wis.

The resolution commemorates the 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The meeting was held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian-American Council.

The resolution wisely endorses President Eisenhower's Middle East program against Communist aggression.

In addition, it rightly stresses the importance of the continued American policy of nonrecognition of the forcible illegal, immoral conquests by the Soviet Union of the Baltic States, and other lands.

Although the Lithuanian and other people have been subjected to brutal genocidal practices on the part of the Soviet Union, although they remain under the terror of the Moscow regime, the flame of liberty still burns brightly. I am sure, in the hearts of the Lithuanian people.

I present the Racine resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas while driving for world conquest, the Soviet Russia has forcibly occupied many free countries, including Lithuania; and

Whereas the variable Communist tactics do not change their basic aim which is to destroy every free nation; and

Whereas by every standard of national and international conduct, Soviet Russia, under its present regime is an outlaw nation; and

Whereas the existence of freedom throughout the world today can only be preserved in those countries where people firmly believe in the policy of deterring aggression by their very own strength and belief in their unity; and

Whereas the tolerances of adherence to a double standard of international morality are giant steps away from the unifying beliefs and principles of a free country and free people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this meeting wholeheartedly support President Eisenhower's Middle East program as a sound countermeasure against the challenge of imperialistic communism which is creating and has already created a grave threat to world's peace and security in that area; and be it further

Resolved, That we oppose any policy advocating the present status quo in Europe as permanent and even as a desirable balance for so-called lasting peace because this policy is simply an expedience of the total over-all communistic plan; and be it further

Resolved, That our Nation through its constituted voice of freedom, the Congress, should cause legislation to be enacted in the United Nations giving assurance that the members of that great body would not be allowed to practice a double standard of international morality which practice is a flagrant abuse of principles of the founders of this great Nation; and be it finally

Resolved, That this mass meeting gratefully express its sincere gratitude to the executive and legislative branches of our Government for its various efforts to aid all men who seek freedom and for its nonrecognition of the annexation of Lithuania into Soviet Russia.

PETER PETRUSAITIS,
Chairman.

STANLEY P. BUDRYS,
Secretary.

RACINE, Wis., February 16, 1957.

THE NATIONAL GUARD—RESOLUTION OF CITY COMMISSION, SANFORD, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Commission of Sanford, Fla., commending the officers and men of Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard, located in Sanford, for their patriotism in serving our country and expressing appreciation and confidence in their ability as citizen soldiers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard, located in Sanford, has served our community, our State, and our Nation honorably and well, both in times of peace and when our Nation was at war; and

Whereas many citizens of Sanford and Seminole County were called to active duty in the Armed Forces of our Nation from our local National Guard unit in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, and served faithfully and honorably, many of whom gave their lives that this Nation might live; and

Whereas the Sanford unit, although not called for Federal service during the Korean conflict, stood ready to defend our community, our State, and our Nation should the call have come; and

Whereas the local unit of the Florida National Guard has a great and heroic history to bulwark its claim to competence; and

Whereas we feel that service as a citizen soldier in the Florida National Guard provides a young man or a veteran with an excellent opportunity to serve in a reserve military force; and

Whereas we feel such service is important to the defense and preparedness of this Nation at the least possible cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commissioners of the City of Sanford Fla.:

1. We acknowledge with grateful hearts those among our citizens who, when called to active service from the local National Guard unit, in either of the great wars or Korean conflict, gave their lives that we might continue our democratic form of Government.

2. We extend to the officers and men of Company B, 154th Armored Infantry Battalion of the Florida National Guard our appreciation for their service and confidence in their ability as citizen soldiers and commend to the young men of our community service in our local unit as an overt manner of expressing patriotism and opportunity to learn the need of discipline, honor, and integrity; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to United States Senators SPESARD L. HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, and Congressman A. S. HERLONG, JR., and the press.

[SEAL]

CITY COMMISSION OF THE
CITY OF SANFORD, FLA.,
DAVID M. GATCHEL,
Mayor.

F. D. SOON,
MERLE W. WARNER,
OTT HIGGINBETHAN,
A. J. WILSON.

Attest:

C. B. SOYER,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF POLISH-AMERICAN CONGRESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the request of my friends in the Polish-American Congress and for the information of Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the resolution adopted as a statement of policy by the board of directors of that organization at their recent meeting in Washington, February 1 and 2, 1957.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POLICY

(Adopted at the meeting of the board of directors of the Polish-American Congress at its meeting at the Raleigh Hotel in Washington, D. C., February 1 and 2, 1957.)

Whereas the recent changes occurring in Poland may have a serious effect on the United States search for peace in the world; and

Whereas the Polish-American Congress, organized 13 years ago and which now has delegates from Polish-American organizations in the United States with a membership of 7 million, has been asked for a statement of policy on these changes; and

Whereas the underlying purpose of the Polish-American Congress, Inc., from its very inception has been to wage a relentless struggle against a world Communist conspiracy which has unrelentingly sought to enslave mankind; and

Whereas the recent changes in Poland would tend to indicate that perhaps the present rulers of Poland have to some degree drawn themselves away from the strict control of the Kremlin; and

Whereas the Polish-American Congress, Inc., firmly believes that these changes forced upon the present rulers of Poland by a gallant people whose dedication to the principles of freedom dates back 1,000 years, and most recently were so heroically demonstrated during the Poznan uprisings; and

Whereas even though the Polish people do not yet enjoy complete freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of self-government, the present Communist rulers of Poland nevertheless mirror to some degree a diminution of the terror and exploitation which prevailed in Poland up to the Poznan uprisings; and have restored to a certain degree religious freedom in that country: Be it therefore

Resolved, That—

1. The Polish-American Congress shall continue its unaltered opposition to the international Communist conspiracy which would enslave the world, and with it eventually the United States.

2. That despite the continued presence of Communist rulers in Poland, the gains made toward freedom in Poland must be recognized and the Polish people must be encouraged to continue their peaceful effort toward complete liberation from Communist rule.

3. That this process can best be served at this time by speedy economic and technical assistance to the Polish people by the United States.

4. That economic assistance to Poland at this time will strengthen her internal economy and bolster her people in their struggle against Communist ideologies.

5. That, because a free and independent Poland is the key to peace in Europe, it lies in the best interest of the United States to undertake this economic assistance, particularly since the indomitable spirit of the Polish people in resisting Russian domination and exploitation gives the world hope

that international communism carries within it the seeds of self-destruction.

6. That the economic and technical assistance given to Poland be carefully controlled by this country perhaps through the use of American inspection teams to assure that machinery and other equipment sent to Poland actually remains in that country for the express purpose of helping Poland and is not later diverted to Russia or her satellites.

7. That, because until the next harvest, Poland will be faced with near famine due to coerced and catastrophic collectivization of her farms, the United States undertake to seek permission from the Polish Government for the sending of CARE packages into Poland.

8. That in addition to the shipment of CARE packages into Poland the United States seek permission for the American Relief for Poland, Inc., or other recognized American relief agencies to operate in Poland for the express purpose of distributing American surplus farm commodities to the Polish people.

9. That the Congress of the United States consider the possibility of reducing United States mailing charges on packages being sent by Americans into Poland thus encouraging a greater flow of these packages which would help the Polish people in their economic crisis.

10. That the United States seek a reduction or elimination of the high-duty tariffs imposed by the rulers of Poland on relief packages now being sent into Poland by Americans. The United States should insist that the rulers of Poland abandon these tariffs before any serious discussions regarding economic assistance to the Polish nation are considered.

11. That the United States take steps immediately to recognize Poland's western boundaries as established in the Potsdam agreement to assure the Poles that these lands will not be taken away from Poland. Through this act the United States could bolster the faith of the enslaved nations in American leadership and dispel the captive peoples' fear that the revival of predatory militarism of Germany is being achieved with American help.

12. That the recognition of Poland's western boundaries along the Oder-Neisse Rivers would deprive Russia of her only claim for keeping Soviet troops in Poland under the guise of helping Poland protect those western boundaries.

13. That we believe Poland's western boundaries to have been formally set at the Potsdam Conference not only on the basis of the nation's historic right to these lands but on the basis of reparation from the German nation for the great and grievous wrong inflicted on the Polish nation in World War II.

14. That the Polish American Congress reaffirm its traditional opposition to the seizure of Poland's eastern lands by Russia and urge the United States to seek through diplomatic intervention the return of these lands to Poland.

15. That the United States delegation to the United Nations continue to press for free and unfettered elections in Poland despite the recent alleged elections held in that country which, in fact, did not give the Polish people complete freedom of self-expression.

16. That the \$75 million Polish private assets frozen in the United States not be released until the zloty-dollar exchange is brought to a more equitable level.

17. That the Congress of the United States adopt amendments to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act which would change the quota system from the 1920 obsolete and unfair formula to a more realistic system which would grant larger quotas to Poland and other middle European nations.

18. That the United States Department of State take immediate steps to enlarge its Embassy staff in Warsaw to facilitate the issuance of immigration and tourist visas to Polish nationals.

19. That the Polish American Congress send to the suffering Polish nation warm and sincere congratulations on their basic faith of a free people living under God, and we congratulate the Polish people for the magnificent manner in which they have conducted themselves in bringing about the great changes in Poland. The world owes these gallant people a debt of gratitude for piercing the first significant hole in the Iron Curtain.

In conclusion, we pledge our moral strength and all material resources of the Polish American Congress to help Poland in her difficult progress toward full freedom—and to support American policy in its search for a just and lasting peace and international security in a world where freedom reigns.

THADDEUS V. ADESKO.

REV. VALERIAN S. KARZ.

STANISLAW R. J. SUCHECKI.

SOPHIA WOJCIK.

ROMAN PUCINSKI.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—MEMORIAL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition signed by Albert E. Cartwright, and 24 other citizens of the State of Illinois from the Granite City, East St. Louis, and Alton area, urging opposition to any new natural-gas bill which would injure the interests of consumers.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRANITE CITY, ILL., January 11, 1957.

HON. PAUL DOUGLAS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We the undersigned are extremely interred in the forthcoming attempt to pass another natural-gas bill. Based on the information that was brought forth during the last session of the Congress, and a review of the background of this proposed legislation we do not believe it to be in the interest of the consumer of natural gas and would therefore respectfully suggest that the proposed natural-gas bill be vigorously opposed.

(Signed by Albert E. Cartwright and 24 other citizens of the State of Illinois.)

SENATOR BYRD'S PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL BUDGET FOR 1958 BY \$5 BILLION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my brief remarks a resolution from the Sumter (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing the proposal of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to reduce the Federal budget for 1958 by \$5 billion.

The people of Sumter County have always manifested a keen interest in keeping our country solvent and on a sound financial basis, and they practice at home what they preach to others. I have always found the people in this great county willing to shoulder their own burdens and to work out their own problems without outside aid or interference. And,

Mr. President, they have done a remarkable job in this respect.

In passing this resolution, the Sumter Chamber of Commerce has paid high tribute to a man whom we in South Carolina hold in the highest esteem. In the general election last November, the people of Sumter County cast a majority of their votes for the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to be President of the United States, even after the distinguished Senator had stated that he did not aspire to this high office.

I believe, with the Senator from Virginia, there are many places where unnecessary and unwise government spending in nondefense areas can be reduced. I hope it will be possible for the Congress, under the prudent leadership of the distinguished Chairman of the Finance Committee, to make these reductions in the budget proposed for 1958.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials from outstanding newspapers in South Carolina which laud the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for his efforts to reduce Government spending. The first editorial is entitled "Might Eventually Win"; and it appeared in the February 18 issue of the State, of Columbia, S. C. The other editorial is entitled "Would Force Balanced Budget." It was published in the February 17 issue of the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S. C.

There being no objection, the resolution and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a record peacetime budget of \$71,800,000,000 has been presented to the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, has stated that this budget should be cut by at least \$5 billion in nondefense areas; and

Whereas Senator BYRD has embarked on a campaign to put these cuts into effect; and

Whereas the Sumter Chamber of Commerce feels that this action is the unanimous desire of the members of this organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sumter Chamber of Commerce endorses the action of Senator BYRD and commends him in the highest for his foresight and dedication to the public interest; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully urge and request that our Senators and Representatives give this action of Senator BYRD their wholehearted support and assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives be asked to take whatever action they deem necessary to put these budget cuts into effect in the appropriations now being considered before the United States Congress.

Adopted this 12th day of February 1957, by the board of directors, Sumter Chamber of Commerce, Inc., representing its 525 members.

J. E. ELDRIDGE,
President, Sumter Chamber of Commerce, Inc., Sumter, S. C.

G. WERBER BRYAN,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

[From the Columbia (S. C.) State of February 18, 1957]

MIGHT EVENTUALLY WIN

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, is one of the few Members of the Federal Congress

who acts as he talks when it comes to economy in government.

The time honored approach on the subject calls for weeping and wailing about how the taxpayer's money is being wasted on wild spending schemes. Once in power, however, the cryers-for-economy make an abrupt 180-degree turn. They dedicate themselves to spending more and more money in a way most likely to influence favorably the greatest number of voters.

Senator BYRD, however, has been economy minded during several administrations. He doesn't talk in glittering generalities. He goes to the trouble to denounce uncalled-for spending, and then proceeds to show precisely where he thinks spending can be curtailed.

Only recently he announced he was going to show where \$5 billion fat could be squeezed out of the Eisenhower budget for the coming fiscal year. Most of his fellow workers only criticize spending. They make no effort to study the budget carefully enough to say what items could be pared down.

The thought occurs that if we could turn financing of the Government over to a few HARRY BYRDS, the country might get out of debt in a couple of centuries.

[From the Orangeburg (S. C.) Times and Democrat of February 17, 1957]

WOULD FORCE BALANCED BUDGET

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire Republican, and Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina Democrat, and other Senators, have introduced a resolution which would require the President and Congress to balance the budget each year. The resolution would make it the responsibility of Congress to see that appropriations during the year are not larger than expenditures.

If this turned out to be the case, because of erroneous revenue prediction, it would be up to Congress to straighten up the budget books the following year. A number of States already operate on this principle and they have been able to stay out of debt as a result of it. In fact, those States which have constitutions requiring a balanced budget are generally in better financial shape than the United States Government.

Of course, in times of emergency, the resolution would not be interpreted to rule out defense expenditures. In such times, emergency spending is recognized as necessary. In peacetime years, the resolution would require the Federal Government to operate in the black and we think this would be a good thing for the taxpayers of this country.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. NEUBERGER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 469. A bill to authorize the United States to defray the cost of assisting the Klamath Tribe of Indians to prepare for termination of Federal supervision, and to defer such termination for a period of 18 months (Rept. No. 92).

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING REPORT ON INVESTIGATION PERTAINING TO TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND RELATED MATTERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to extend the date for filing a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to tech-

nical assistance and related matters, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That section 3 of Senate Resolution 162, agreed to February 8, 1956, to investigate matters pertaining to technical assistance and related programs, as amended by Senate Resolution 60, agreed to January 30, 1957, is further amended by striking out "February 28, 1957" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1957."

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Arthur Larson, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the United States Information Agency;

John M. Allison, of the District of Columbia to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Indonesia;

Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York, to be a representative on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, reappointment; and

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, reappointment.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1268. A bill for the relief of Don Q. Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1269. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create a Board for the Condemnation of Insanitary Buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended; and

S. 1270. A bill to incorporate the Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1271. A bill for the relief of Daniel Alcide Charlebois; and

S. 1272. A bill for the relief of Zisimos Niforatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1273. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers in the food industries who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (by request):

S. 1274. A bill to amend the act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077), to remove restrictions on the use of a portion of the Springfield Confederate Cemetery, Springfield, Mo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1275. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1276. A bill for the relief of Emilio Valle Duarte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1277. A bill for the relief of Edgars Pedraudze and his wife, Alma Pedraudze; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1278. A bill for the relief of Ernest C. St. Onge;

S. 1279. A bill for the relief of Shih Hing Lee; and

S. 1280. A bill for the relief of Antonio da Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Enrique R. Godinez; his wife, Enriqueta P. Godinez; and their daughter, Lydia M. Godinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1282. A bill to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. CASE of South Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. POTTER:

S. 1283. A bill for the relief of Garth Cecil Breden; and

S. 1284. A bill for the relief of Josef Salamoun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania) (by request):

S. 1285. A bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, a national organization of combat wounded composed solely of Purple Hearters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1286. A bill for the relief of Ursula Ann McFarland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1287. A bill for the relief of Heinz August Schwarz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1288. A bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the Office of President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. DOUGLAS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 1289. A bill to provide an elected mayor, city council, school board, and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 1290. A bill for the relief of Lee-Ana Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1291. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Subport of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WATKINS when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

The following resolutions were submitted or reported and referred, as indicated:

VARIOUS STUDIES OF NATION'S POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 98) which was re-

ferred to the Committee on Agricultural and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas there is much concern over continued low prices for broilers and movement of market eggs; and

Whereas broiler producers supplied consumers with 30 percent more meat in 1956 than in 1955, but received only 1-percent increase in gross income; and

Whereas the broiler-feed ratio has deteriorated to the extent that it discourages broiler production, and the egg-feed ratio likewise is discouraging: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall arrange for exhaustive studies into the Nation's poultry industry with the view of determining—

(1) The entire price structure of poultry and poultry products from hatchery to market;

(2) Methods employed by producers to continue and expand production;

(3) Problems of markets and market outlets;

(4) Feasible action to stabilize the poultry industry.

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 99) to extend the date for filing a report on the investigation of matters pertaining to technical assistance and related matters, which was placed on the calendar.

(See resolution printed in full which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, RELATING TO DEDUCTION OF CERTAIN MEDICAL EXPENSES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense.

Let me explain, by citing an actual case with which I am familiar, the need for favorable action on this bill.

One of my constituents has been supporting his aged mother since he was 15 years of age. His mother is now 94 years of age, and requires constant medical attention. If she were kept in a hospital my constituent could deduct the expense for income tax purposes. But the cost of continuous hospital care is prohibitive to him.

He has, however, at an annual expense of more than \$2,000, had his mother provided the constant medical attention she requires in a rest home. But he is now advised that this annual expenditure of more than \$2,000 annually is not tax deductible. Hospital care is deductible. Rest home care is not.

I have had considerable correspondence regarding this case with the Internal Revenue Service, and I am sure that some of my colleagues have tried to get administrative relief for constituents in similar situations. I have found the IRS people sympathetic and understanding. But they feel that under existing law they cannot allow as tax deductions expenditures such as those incurred by my constituent.

I feel that the current law and interpretation placed upon it are most unfair to many fine citizens who are doing their best to discharge their obligations to their families and their Government, and I hope that this injustice will be corrected speedily.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1275) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit amounts paid for the institutional care of a disabled person to be deducted as a medical expense, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD), was received read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will provide formal educational training, on-the-job training, and on-the-farm training, for veterans who are not now eligible under the Korean GI law.

It will be recalled that the delimiting date for veterans of the Korean war was January 31, 1955. None of our servicemen entering the Armed Forces after that date are presently eligible for educational benefits.

This bill, if enacted, would provide educational benefits for servicemen enlisting or being drafted so long as there is compulsory military service in the United States.

This proposed legislation would offer 1½ days of education or training for each day of active service up to a maximum of 3 calendar years. Thus, 24 months of service would provide 36 months of school. The 36 months is equal to 4 college years of 9 months each.

Obvious additional benefits would accrue to the country and the veteran under the bill. One would be the raising of veterans' incomes. It has been said by some that the additional revenue derived from income taxes paid by veterans whose income levels have been increased by GI training will cancel out the cost to the Government of that training.

Another national benefit will be to provide a means for the United States to obtain more engineers and technical specialists. This is a field of great need. Young men could build on their military technical training and become graduate engineers.

Also, I believe the offering of this benefit will help to solve the recruitment problems of the armed services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1282) to amend title II of the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952 to provide educational benefits to persons who perform active service in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, while compulsory military service is required under existing laws of the United States, introduced by Mr. CASE of South Dakota, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PREFERENTIAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY ELECTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1288) to encourage the States to hold preferential primary elections for the nomination of candidates for the office of President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The analysis presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARIES BILL

PURPOSE: TO ENCOURAGE STATES TO HOLD PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENTIAL PRIMARIES

1. Establishes a national commission of 5 persons appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of 5 years, with one appointment per year, no more than three of which may be members of the same political party. To be eligible a commissioner must represent a party which polled at least 10 million votes in the last preceding presidential election.

2. Provides for a commission staff.

3. Provides that the commission will certify, under certain conditions, the names of presidential candidates to the States by March 1. To be eligible a candidate must have at least 1,000 names on a petition filed with the commission from each State if less than 4 States, or 1,000 names from 75 percent of the States if more than 4 States, and must designate a specific political party under which his name shall be placed.

Provides that a potential candidate's name will be certified unless he withdraws it.

4. Provides for payments to the States for expenses incurred in holding a presidential primary:

(a) A top limit of 20 cents per vote in the presidential primary.

(b) No payment for votes cast for a party which received less than 10 million votes in the last preceding presidential election.

(c) Proper accounting shall be made by a responsible State official to the commission.

5. To be eligible States must:

(a) Have a presidential preference primary law in effect by January 1 of the year of the primary.

(b) Provide that the primary be held between April 1 and July 31.

(c) Allow only those candidates certified by the commission to be on the ballot.

(d) Provide that voters may qualify to vote if they are eligible to vote for the most numerous body of the State legislature.

(e) Provide that voters may vote only in the preferential primary of the party of which they have registered affiliation.

(f) Provide that the results of the primary be "binding to a reasonable extent" on the delegates to the national conventions. The commission shall decide the meaning of "binding to a reasonable extent."

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND TO TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill

to authorize the conveyance to the Territory of Alaska of a 10-acre tidal flat adjacent to the city of Juneau, Alaska.

An identical bill was introduced in the 84th Congress too late to gain approval of both Houses before adjournment. The original sponsor of the bill, Representative A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, is re-introducing it on the House side, and I am introducing it in the Senate in an effort to help expedite its passage before conclusion of the 60-day biennial session of the Territorial Legislature, which is now meeting.

If the land is conveyed to the Territory of Alaska, the Territorial Legislature plans to lease the property to the National Guard of Alaska for a headquarters site. It formerly was used as the headquarters of the Juneau Support of Embarkation.

No objections were offered to this proposed legislation when it was before the House at the last session, and I hope that we can expedite the measure in both Houses at this time and thus assist the Territory and the National Guard. The land in question is tidal land which would be transferred to the Territory at statehood, as a routine matter. My proposal would merely expedite the transaction as a courtesy to the Territory. Additional details are provided in House Report 2583 of the 84th Congress, 2d Session, filed in connection with H. R. 6779.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1291) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property of the United States located in Juneau, Alaska, known as the Juneau Support of Embarkation, to the Territory of Alaska, introduced by Mr. WATKINS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADJUSTMENT OF CORPORATE NORMAL TAX AND SURTAX RATES— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 150) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to adjust corporate normal tax and surtax rates, introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on January 7, 1957.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WATKINS:

Address delivered by him before national western mining conference, in Denver, Colo., on February 9, 1957.

By Mr. BEALL:

Statement prepared by him on 39th anniversary of Lithuanian independence.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

Article entitled "A Republican Prescribes for His Party," written by Senator CASE of

New Jersey, and published in the magazine section of the New York Times of February 17, 1957.

CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the 2-minute rule, I wish to submit for the RECORD an editorial from a Canadian newspaper, the Calgary Herald, in criticism of the Dulles foreign policy. I desire to make the following comment: In the great crisis which now has existed for many weeks in the field of foreign policy, I am glad to note that our foreign policy has finally moved off the golf course and out of Georgia hunting grounds and back into the White House. At least the wild turkeys of Georgia will be safer, even though the people of Israel and their free institutions may not.

I know that some of my colleagues feel that we would perform a disservice to the country if we insisted on full debate in the Senate on our unfortunate foreign policy as presented by the Eisenhower doctrine. However, such debate will occur in the Senate, regardless of whether anyone may feel that there should be insistence on quick, steamroller action in the Senate on the Middle East joint resolution.

In regard to the Israeli situation, my feeling is as follows: I certainly hope that Israel sits tight until it obtains from the United Nations guaranties of its survival, because I know of no fact which would justify Israel in accepting any guaranty from the United States, outside the United Nations. I am one Senator who thinks that American unilateral action in the Middle East should cease. I completely agree with the editorial in the Canadian newspaper, in criticism of the Dulles foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. DULLES OUGHT TO BE FIRED, NOW

Mr. John Foster Dulles, the United States Secretary of State, has now opined that any American soldier called upon to fight in the Middle East would feel a lot safer if he did not have British and French troops alongside him.

Mr. Dulles was arguing for support for his new policy under which the President would have standby power to use United States troops in the Middle East to repel Communist aggression.

The plain implication in his newest statement is that Britain and France have behaved so badly, have discredited themselves so thoroughly, that any United States soldier's life would be endangered if that soldier were so unfortunate as to be caught in the company of a British or French soldier.

This, we are forced to say, is just about the most remarkable way to win and retain allies we have ever heard of. But it does not surprise us that this preposterous utterance comes from Mr. Dulles, the earth's most undiplomatic diplomat, international fumbler and downright menace.

We don't think it would be going too far to say that the two greatest dangers to world peace at this moment are the Kremlin and Mr. Dulles personally. The former must be beside itself with joy at the sight of the crumbling Western alliance, and Mr. Dulles

scarcely lets a day go by without hacking another great chunk out of that alliance. Long ago we expressed our belief that Mr. Dulles is an international catastrophe, and we see no reason to alter that opinion except to question whether it is strong enough.

It has been quite nauseating enough to contemplate this ham-handed and peripatetic meddler proposing that the United States adopt the kind of policy that the British and French would have welcomed with open arms a year or so ago, after having forced them to warlike action by insipid, supine and gauche United States foreign policy.

But surely it is intolerable to hear this same man airily tagging the British and French as dangerous companions for United States boys in any future move in the Middle East. If Mr. Dulles had not been so appallingly blind, ignorant, arrogant and stubborn a few months ago the whole tragic business might never have happened. It is an unendurable insult to have this same person condemn those who had the plain, old-fashioned guts to do what had to be done while the United States, at his wholly headed instigation, stood fiddling on the sidelines—which it chose to call the high ramparts of moral authority.

Mr. Dulles must hold the record for losing more international friends and international good will than any other United States Secretary of State in history. His stupidity is scarcely credible. President Eisenhower ought to fire him forthwith.

FARM PRICES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last week I reported to the Senate the fact that Secretary of Agriculture Benson was presenting to the Congress and the people figures for realized net farm income which did not include any adjustment for inventory. That had to do with farm income.

Now I present what would appear to be another misleading presentation by Mr. Benson, having to do with farm prices, also given the Congress last month, and since repeated by him in talks around the country. Mr. Benson asserts:

Prices received by farmers have been running 7 percent above a year ago.

It is true prices in December 1956 were 7 percent higher than in December 1955; but why did not Mr. Benson give the complete picture? If he had, he would have said that prices for the year 1956 averaged exactly the same as in 1955.

The figures from his own Department prove it. They show the price index was 236 for 1955, and 236 for 1956. All who read or listened to Mr. Benson's statement might well believe that prices in 1956 were 7 percent above 1955. Nothing could be further from the facts.

Let me present how dangerous is this apparent policy of lifting out of context the month most favorable for the position desired.

Mr. Benson told the Senate Agriculture Committee on January 29 that "prices received by farmers have been running 7 percent above a year ago."

At that time he was one-half right, even though the only month in 1956 in which prices were 7 percent above the same month of 1955 was December.

When he repeated it in St. Louis, Mo., on February 7, however, he was wrong. Prices received by farmers were not "running 7 percent above a year ago," because prices in January 1957 were not 7 percent above those in January 1956.

Mr. President, if we are ever going to arrive at a sound program for the family-size farms, in addition to the factory-size farms, it is first going to be necessary for us to obtain all the truth, not merely a part of it, because partial truth is an evasion of truth.

AIR MECHANICS' RATINGS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on February 4 I addressed myself to the subject of the Cordiner report, and its relationship to the retention of trained personnel in our armed services. Because of my interest in this field, I asked my staff to conduct a research into the air mechanics' ratings which existed in the Air Corps between 1926 and 1942. These ratings were made possible by Public Law 446, passed on the 2d of July 1926. They were abolished by Public Law 607 of the 77th Congress under the Reorganization Act, in 1942. Our air forces, ground forces, and naval forces need this type of trained skills now just as much as they needed them in 1926.

I ask unanimous consent that the study my staff made of this subject be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

Without objection the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR MECHANICS' RATINGS, AIR CORPS, 1926-42

Congress, in 1926, enacted legislation designed to provide more effectively for the national defense by increasing the efficiency of the Air Corps of the United States Army. The bill, among many other things, elevated the military air arm of the Army from the status of a service to that of a corps. In addition, the legislation recognized that the newly established Air Corps needed highly qualified personnel to maintain its complicated equipment.

This latter matter had received considerable attention by a special aircraft committee of the House of Representatives and the President's Aircraft Board, known respectively as the Lampert committee and the Morrow board. Both of these committees, and particularly the Lampert committee, recommended:

"That additional compensation necessary to secure and adequate number of competent mechanics to maintain aircraft in efficient operation, be provided; that such mechanics should be relieved of routine military duty."

Under then existing law, enlisted personnel in the Army were classified in seven pay grades from \$21 to \$126 a month. In addition to these basic pay rates, Congress, by act of June 3, 1916, as amended by act of June 4, 1920, established a system of bonus pay for certain specialists ranging from \$3 to \$30 a month.

It was brought out in the hearings of 1926 that these bonuses were not sufficient to attract and retain required Air Corps skills in view of the fact that:

"In the automobile industry the average monthly wage of those who do the same kind of work is \$150.22 a month. In the Airmail Service the average wage is \$154.04."

Based upon the justification presented by the Air Corps, the act of July 2, 1926 (Public Law 446) provided:

"Enlisted men of the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh grades in the Air Corps who have demonstrated their fitness and shown that they possess the necessary technical qualifications therefor and are engaged upon the duties pertaining thereto may be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe. Each enlisted

man while holding the rating of air mechanic, first class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the second grade, and each enlisted man while holding the rating of air mechanic, second class, and performing the duties as such shall receive the pay of the third grade: *Provided*, That such number as the Secretary of War may determine as necessary, not to exceed 14 percent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the Air Corps, shall be rated as air mechanics, first class, or air mechanics, second class."

Taking the then existing pay rates (see table 1), any man in the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh pay grades who held the rating of air mechanic, first class, would be entitled to receive the pay of a second-grade airman, or \$84. Any man in these grades classed as an air mechanic, second class, would receive the pay of an enlisted man of the third grade, which at that time was \$72.

It should be noted that the Secretary of War determined the number of ratings that were needed but he was limited by law to restrict the number of ratings not to exceed 14 percent of the authorized strength of the Air Force. For example, the act of July 2, 1926, which laid down a 5-year program of expansion of the Army Air Corps, both as to equipment and personnel, established a force of 1,800 planes, 1,650 officers, and 15,000 enlisted personnel in the Air Corps. Actually, however, as of June 1928 the Air Corps had 9,493 enlisted men of which 305 were rated as air mechanics, first class, and 577 were rated as air mechanics, second class. On June 30, 1930, the Air Corps had 12,034 enlisted personnel, of which 616 were rated as air mechanics, first class, and 882 were rated as air mechanics, second class. In 1941 (the last year that this system of classification was used) the enlisted strength of the Air Corps totaled 133,775, of which 3,713 were rated as first class air mechanics and 4,753 were rated as second class air mechanics.

In the hearings of 1941 before the Senate Subcommittee on the Committee of Military Affairs, which preceded the enactment of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, an Interwar, Navy, Treasury, and Commerce Departments Committee, reporting on the specialist rating system, stated:

"Theoretically the system is good, but as a matter of practical application it is not satisfactory. Modern equipment, its maintenance, repair, and operation requires that many of these specialists exercise command incident to the supervision as well as the instruction of others. Many of the duties for which specialists' ratings were designed require highly intelligent and able men who are either not to be found in the lower grades or who should not be kept there. It is recommended that specialist ratings be paid on the basis of grades rather than trades. If this is done grades would be used in lieu thereof by the Army and Marine Corps as is now done in the Navy and Coast Guard."

It was brought out in the hearings that the Air Corps was abolishing these specialist ratings "as fast as they [the Air Corps] can reprint the Tables of Organization." Therefore, under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607, 77th Cong.), specialists' pay ratings were abolished and the monthly base pay of enlisted personnel ranging from \$50 to \$138 was established.

An analysis as to how effective the air mechanic specialist ratings were in improving the retention of airmen in the Air Corps can be gleaned from a review of the Air Corps reenlistment rate for the period fiscal year 1926 to 1940. These statistics are contained in table 2. Table 3 shows the reenlistment rates in the infantry corps for certain comparable years. It is realized, of course, that the comparatively better reenlistment rate in the Air Corps was naturally due in some part to such factors as "glamour" of the Air Force, and opportuni-

ties for receiving training in skills that would be of value in a civilian occupation. It is also recognized that the economic consequences following the stock market crash of October 1929 also played a large part in influencing enlisted military personnel to reenlist. However, this latter factor was equally as true of the infantry as it was of the Air Corps. Yet from the statistics given, the rate of Air Corps retentions was considerably greater than it was for the infantry. Thus it should be concluded that special pay attractions offered air mechanic specialists did play a large part in improved Air Corps retention rates in the pre-World War II period.

TABLE 1.—Act of June 10, 1922, Public Law 235, 67th Cong.—Monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army and Marine Corps

Grade:	Amount
1st.....	\$126
2d.....	84
3d.....	72
4th.....	54
5th.....	42
6th.....	30
7th.....	21
Specialist ratings:	
1st.....	30
2d.....	25
3d.....	20
4th.....	15
5th.....	6
6th.....	3

TABLE 2.—Air Corps reenlistments, fiscal years 1926-40

Fiscal year	Air Corps total enlisted strength (end of fiscal year)	Number discharged		Number reenlisted within 3 months after discharge	Percent rate
		Expiration of service	Other ¹		
1926...	8,723	1,585	1,949	1,262	35
1927...	9,077	2,410	2,087	1,735	38
1928...	9,493	1,619	2,110	1,605	43
1929...	10,890	1,739	2,295	2,025	50
1930...	12,034	2,703	2,470	2,817	54
1931...	13,194	2,443	1,859	2,947	68
1932...	13,360	2,964	1,742	3,401	73
1933...	13,497	3,849	1,637	4,132	75
1934...	14,314	3,257	910	3,341	80
1935...	14,719	2,931	1,414	3,565	82
1936...	15,640	3,368	1,241	3,785	82
1937...	17,299	3,704	1,795	4,100	74
1938...	18,909	3,034	1,570	3,967	86
1939...	20,838	3,799	2,780	5,318	81
1940...	47,812	4,643	8,448	12,479	91

¹ Honorable causes such as: Return from overseas with less than 2 months service retainability, disqualified as flying cadet, special cases, accept appointment as officer, enter flying training.

TABLE 3.—Infantry reenlistments [Sample year]

Fiscal year	Total Infantry enlisted strength	Number discharged		Number reenlisted within 3 months after discharge	Percent rate
		Expiration of service	Other ¹		
1926...	40,344	8,955	6,624	5,504	36
1927...	39,574	12,208	6,624	7,596	41
1930...	41,259	11,533	5,486	8,056	48
1931...	40,569	9,497	3,652	7,604	57
1933...	39,049	10,993	4,544	11,492	70
1934...	39,476	8,629	2,027	7,001	69
1937...	54,707	8,361	4,634	8,021	61
1938...	57,293	7,067	5,467	8,341	64

¹ Honorable causes such as: Return from overseas with less than 2 months service retainability, disqualified as flying cadet, special cases, accept appointment as officer, enter flying training.

PLEASANT VALLEY DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement which I shall not take the time to read

but which I have already sent to the newspapers, setting forth my criticism of the Secretary of the Interior for his move in regard to the Pleasant Valley Dam. I urge the appropriate Senate committee to see to it that the Seaton program is thoroughly investigated, because when it is investigated its phoniness will be shown up for what it is.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE RAAPS SEATON MOVE ON PLEASANT VALLEY DAM

"It will not fool many people for long."

This comment came on the Senate floor this afternoon from Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, in discussing the proposed "study" of the so-called High Pleasant Valley Dam which was announced on Monday by Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton. Such a dam would flood out site of the Hells Canyon Dam.

"Seaton in this case is merely proving out the prediction I made when introducing the bill to authorize the great high dam at Hells Canyon," Morse declared. "That prediction was that Seaton would seek to exploit the political popularity of the semantic term 'high dam.'"

The Oregon Senator said:

"Seaton is involved in a political attempt to save face without effecting any basic change in the wasteful resource program of this administration. His letter informing the Federal Power Commission of a forthcoming 'study' of high Pleasant Valley means very little and does very little.

"What it fails to do, however, is of the utmost gravity. It fails to emphasize the need for full and comprehensive water resource development, which is what the Hells Canyon controversy is all about.

"The new dam under study would wash out the Idaho Power Co.'s low Hells Canyon Dam—1 of the 3 dams in the company's so-called plan.

"Seaton's action underlines the critical need for upstream storage for flood control and power in the Columbia Basin. Pleasant Valley would not make up the storage deficit if the high Hells Canyon Dam is lost.

"The Secretary of the Interior can prove that he is genuinely and sincerely interested in flood and power storage by reopening the Hells Canyon case before the Federal Power Commission, as he now apparently is introducing a new factor into the Mountain Sheep and Pleasant Valley case before the FPC.

"Until Seaton makes such a forthright move, I can only conclude that the administration's resource giveaway policies of the past 4 years are still in force."

SIXTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE PARENT-TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to take occasion to mark the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Parent-Teachers Association. It was in 1897, a year after I was born, when McKinley was President, William P. Frye, of Maine, was President pro tempore of the Senate, and Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, was Speaker of the House, that this organization was established in the Nation's Capital. It had a noble purpose which has been consistently maintained, namely, the well being of the children, who are the citizens of tomorrow. This organization has grown until today it has more than 42,000 units with a membership in excess of 10 million, including

more than 3½ million men. How closely it is identified with schools can be seen from the fact that more than 700,000 teachers and school administrators are members.

Yet, Mr. President, the PTA has carefully avoided seeking to dominate or control schools and education. It is still devoted to its original purposes—good schools where the anchors of character are formed, good communities where the right atmosphere prevails, and a good country where opportunity is safeguarded and each shall have a chance to fulfill his destiny.

It is truly an organization of citizens with no selfish ends to pursue and no purpose save the betterment of the schools where children are educated, the communities in which they live, and the country which they will in the future help to direct.

NATIONAL CHILD LABOR COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, 50 years ago, on February 21, 1907, the Congress by Public Law 103 granted a congressional charter to the National Child Labor Committee. At that time the committee was less than 3 years old, having been founded in April 1904, but already in its short life it had begun to quicken the public conscience and to arouse concern for the hundreds of thousands of children who labored each day in mines and factories and canneries.

It is my happy pleasure and privilege today, when the National Child Labor Committee celebrates the golden anniversary of the charter we granted, to present in the Senate a brief testimonial statement.

A half century ago our country was vastly different from what it is now. Out of a population of 82 millions, 6½ million workers were idle—seeking but unable to find regular employment. Some 4 million of these were public paupers; millions more lived in abject poverty—"underfed, underclothed, poorly housed," in the words of Robert Hunter.

Yet, at the same time that millions of adults were unemployed, almost 2 million children between the ages of 10 and 15 years toiled regular 10- and 12-hour days in mines, in mills, on farms, and on the city streets, ostensibly to help keep their families together and out of the poorhouse. And there were many more thousands younger than 10 whom nobody even bothered to count. Life, like labor, was cheap, and not a day passed but some child was made a helpless cripple. But this was "the era of complacency," as the historian Frederick Lewis Allen called it.

It was in this era of complacency that a small group of humanitarians met in New York City, on April 15, 1904, and formed themselves into the National Child Labor Committee. Resolutely they declared that industrialism must not be allowed to degrade humanity, that child labor was intolerable, that there was need for a national body which would be a great moral force in protecting chil-

dren, for childhood was a sacred thing. This was the beginning and their voices were to become the articulate conscience of America on this issue. Three years later, 50 years ago, the Congress granted them a congressional charter.

There were 15 founding members of the National Child Labor Committee—Felix Adler, Francis G. Caffey, Robert W. de Forest, Edward T. Devine, Homer Folks, William E. Harmon, John S. Huyler, Mrs. Florence Kelley, James H. Kirkland, V. Everit Macy, Edgar Gardner Murphy, Isaac M. Seligman, Lillian D. Wald, Paul M. Warburg, and John W. Wood. Only one, Homer Folks, now 90, is still alive, but the committee still has an active role to play in fulfilling its original objectives.

Today, 50 years after the granting of a charter by Congress, the National Child Labor Committee can view with considerable satisfaction the great changes it helped to secure. The abusive child labor practices which existed in mill, mine and factory early in the century are now happily a thing of history.

Nevertheless the committee's task is far from finished. In this fortunate land of ours, abundantly blessed by rich resources, most of our children have unparalleled opportunities to grow in security and decency and dignity. But a minority do not. And this is particularly true of the children of migratory farm workers who move with their parents from State to State to help harvest the fruits and fibers which feed and clothe this Nation, and a good part of the world as well.

Many of these children live under abominable conditions, and their educational neglect makes them the largest single source of illiterates in the Nation. The United States Office of Education has estimated that 600,000 of them are not even getting a public-school education, and the United States Children's Bureau has reported that few of them ever get to see a doctor, a teacher, a nurse, or a welfare worker.

According to a presidential commission a few years ago, the average yearly earnings for an adult migrant farm worker amounted to about \$520 a year. And yet these migrants are excluded from the Federal minimum-wage law and from the benefits of nearly all social and labor legislation. Most State child-labor laws usually do not apply to the children, and far too few communities make any real effort to encourage their regular school attendance. The National Child Labor Committee is to be warmly commended for its current campaign to expand educational opportunities for this most neglected group of our young citizens.

While a half century has passed since the Congress gave a charter to the National Child Labor Committee, and while vast changes have occurred in our culture and in our economy, the committee has held steadfast to one goal: to stimulate community responsibility and to develop public policy so that all of America's youth might be reared healthfully, grow happily, and mature eventually into productive, creative, and informed citizens of the land.

The name of this voluntary agency suggests, but does not itself completely delineate, the full measure of its interests. Not content with just being against something, the committee is for programs of a positive nature. It is concerned with the children who work and the conditions of their work. And it is also concerned with those children now in school who, in one fashion or another, are being prepared for—or unprepared for—eventual work. It is deeply concerned about those youths whose educational growth has already come to a halt and who aimlessly waste their adolescence in idleness, not at work, not at school, not at any other productive pursuit.

These three groups, the youthful workers, the to-be workers, and the nonworkers, add up to all the children in all the cities and on all the farms and in all the families everywhere across the broad reaches of America. This is the compass of the National Child Labor Committee. May it pursue its worthy aims until its task is completely done.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES F. BYRNES BEFORE THE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

MR. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an outstanding address delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes on February 9, 1957, before the Illinois State Bar Association, in Peoria, Ill. The text of this address was printed in many newspapers and in the widely read magazine, U. S. News & World Report. This text appeared in the Anderson (S. C.) Free Press, one of the outstanding and most courageous weekly newspapers in the United States.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES F. BYRNES BEFORE ILLINOIS STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

Long ago thoughtful people of the South realized that Abraham Lincoln was correct in his opposition to slavery.

For the indefensible traffic in human beings many people were responsible. Traders from Spain and France, as well as from Great Britain, encouraged the African Chiefs to sell their people into slavery. Later, New England traders brought thousands of slaves to our shores.

Southerners who bought and worked African slaves shared the guilt of the slave traders. Certainly, I would make no defense of slavery. God never made a man wise enough or good enough to own another human being.

Most Southerners now believe that had Lincoln lived, the South would not have been subjected to the oppressions of the reconstruction period which aroused more resentment than the sufferings of the war.

They believe, too, that Lincoln, would have appreciated that the heroic fight of Confederate soldiers, the vast majority of whom owned no slaves, was due, not to the desire to perpetuate slavery, but to their belief that under the Constitution of the United States it was the right of each State to regulate its own internal affairs.

They feared that if the right of a State to control its internal affairs in one instance was denied, the Federal Government would soon make further encroachments upon local governments.

The people of the South respect the written Constitution of the United States. Heretofore they have had great respect for the Supreme Court because they have regarded that court as the defender of the Constitution. They have relied upon the Court for protection against either the executive or the Congress, acting in violation of the Constitution.

When we speak of the law of the land, we refer to the United States Constitution, which, according to article 4, shall be the supreme law of the land.

We regard the Constitution as a statement of principles by which all departments of government are bound, the liberties of the people assured, and that it can be altered only in the manner provided in the instrument.

In the early days of the Republic the people were vigilant in protecting their liberties.

But in time the people became busy and indifferent. Gradually in the courts there was developed the doctrine of judicial review, but it was founded on the principle that acts of government contrary to the Constitution were void.

All of us will agree, as Chief Justice Marshall stated in the Marbury-Madison case, "the Constitution is either a superior paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislative shall please to alter it."

If the latter be true, a written constitution is an absurdity. It is equally clear that if the Constitution is the superior paramount law it cannot be altered whenever the Supreme Court wishes to alter it. That would be an absurdity.

If the Supreme Court can alter the Constitution by its decisions, then five men—a majority of the Court—can make the Court a constitution maker instead of a constitutional defender.

Throughout our history Presidents of the United States from Washington to Franklin D. Roosevelt have warned against the Court attempting to usurp such power.

NEW POWERS EXERCISED

Time and again the Court itself has declared it had no power to amend the Constitution. Now it is agreed by students of the law that the Court, while still admitting its lack of power to amend, is exercising new powers without the public realizing that the powers are new.

The trend is well illustrated by the school case.

In 1952 a three-judge court presided over by Hon. John J. Parker, senior judge of the fourth circuit, in a case from Clarendon County, S. C., held that the segregation statutes of South Carolina did not violate the 14th amendment. Lawyers for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People appealed to the Supreme Court.

Some months after the case was first argued, the Court asked for further argument. Because the 14th amendment makes no reference to schools, the Court requested counsel to direct their arguments to the question "What evidence is there that the Congress which submitted and the State legislatures and conventions which ratified the 14th amendment, contemplated or did not contemplate, understood, or did not understand, that it would abolish segregation in public schools."

The attorneys general of all States interested in the issue, were invited to file briefs. Many of them responded. Among other things it was shown that about the time the amendment was submitted Members of the Congress proposed that in the Constitution and in statutes, segregated schools should be prohibited. The proposals were rejected.

The legislative history so conclusively demonstrated that the prohibition of segregated schools was not contemplated either

by the framers of the 14th amendment or by the States in ratifying it, that the Supreme Court could not assert otherwise. The most it could declare, in an effort to justify its decision, was that the legislative history was inconclusive.

When the 14th amendment did not mention schools and the Court decided the legislative history was inconclusive, the Court should have declared, as it did only 11 months ago, in March 1956, in the case of *Ullmann v. United States* (350 U. S. 427), that "nothing new can be put into the Constitution except through the amendatory process."

The Court should have upheld the Constitution its members are sworn to uphold. It should have upheld the doctrine of separate but equal facilities which had been sustained by the Supreme Court in 8 different cases since 1896.

Instead, the Court declared "We cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the amendment was adopted, or to 1896 when *Plessy v. Ferguson* was written." Then why did the Court ask counsel to file briefs as to the intent of the Congress in 1868? And why did the Court ask counsel to argue whether the Court was bound by its previous decisions such as *Plessy v. Ferguson*?

If the Court could not turn the clock back to consider the intent of the drafters of the 14th amendment in 1868, what chance is there of the Court turning the clock back to 1778 when the Constitution was drafted?

If age so outmodes the eternal truths of the Constitution, what chance would the Ten Commandments have with the present Court?

The doctrine of stare decisis is not sacred but when a case involves an interpretation of the Constitution and that interpretation is sustained by the Court's decisions over a period of 60 years, we should be able to rely upon it as the law. * * *

SEVEN OTHER CASES

Clearly, then when the Court added to the 14th amendment the prohibition against segregation in public schools, that prohibition, like all other prohibitions of the amendment, could be enforced only by congressional legislation.

Instead of legislating to prohibit it, Congress for 75 years specifically appropriated for segregated schools in the District of Columbia.

And in recent years in appropriating for the school lunch program, Congress, by implication, approved segregated schools by providing that if a State maintained separate schools for races, funds should not be paid unless they were equitably distributed between the segregated schools.

But the Court that was unwilling to leave the amendment of the Constitution to the Congress and the States, as provided in that instrument, likewise was unwilling to leave to the Congress the enforcement of the new 14th amendment.

A DANGEROUS POWER

It substituted the Courts for the Congress. That means the power of injunction. The power of injunction is a dangerous power often abused.

Where Congress, in precise language applicable to all citizens, would define what constitutes a crime, and the punishment therefor, already it is apparent that the judge-made laws will radically differ in the different jurisdictions.

In July 1955, the Honorable John J. Parker, senior judge of the Fourth Circuit, speaking for the three-judge court having jurisdiction of the South Carolina segregation case, said that the Supreme Court "has not decided that the States must mix persons of different races in the schools or must require them to attend schools, or must deprive them of the right of choosing the schools they attend. What it has decided, and all that it has decided, is that a State may not deny to any

person, on account of race, the right to attend any school that it maintains. * * * The Constitution, in other words, does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination."

That Court held voluntary segregation possible. However, in Tennessee a United States District Judge took a different view. He issued an order on January 4, 1956, which according to him, "requires adoption by school authorities of Anderson County of a program of integration that will expeditiously permit the enrollment of Negroes of high-school grades to the high school of that county."

Later that district judge enjoined certain parties who were named, and all others who may be acting in counsel with them from interfering with what the judge called the integration order or from picketing Clinton high school, either by words or acts or otherwise.

Subsequent events demonstrate the chaos that will result from these judge-made laws. In Clinton, Tenn., troops and tanks were ordered to a school, but disorders continued in and out of the school. When the soldiers withdrew the Attorney General of the United States ordered an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the court order.

In December a white minister who had no connection with the school voluntarily accompanied certain colored students to the school. After he left and while passing some citizens on the street in front of the police station, he was struck in the face by a man who claimed the minister shoved him. The minister was not seriously hurt.

By order of the court, the man who struck the minister, along with about 12 other persons, including another minister and a woman, who were on the sidewalk where the fight took place, were charged with criminal contempt for violating the injunction order. Released under heavy bond, they were to have a hearing on January 28, but the hearing was postponed.

The people of many States await with interest the result of that hearing. They are anxious to know:

First, whether the district judge, instead of enjoining discrimination against individuals, had the power to issue an order requiring the adoption of an integration program.

Second, whether striking a citizen who has no connection with the public schools, at a point some distance from the school building, constitutes an interference with the court's integration order.

Third, heretofore it has been thought that where an act was alleged to violate an order of injunction and at the same time violate the criminal law of the United States or any State, the defendant was entitled to trial by a jury. The people want to know if this has been repealed by the court.

Fourth, whether the presence of citizens at a place on the street, where an assault and battery is committed upon a person not connected with the school or its students constitutes an interference with the court's integration order, justifying punishment by a judge with or without a jury trial.

The President was quoted as saying in response to a question at a recent press conference that the problem at Clinton was now in the hands of local courts and local officials. If correctly noted, the President was misinformed. The citizens have been arrested by order of the United States district judge and the school children have been threatened with the secret police of the United States, who were sent to the scene by the United States Attorney General.

The only local official in the picture is the prosecuting attorney of the county who was so thoroughly frightened that he told the assembled children of the school that if they were guilty of misconduct they would be reported to the FBI and "uncalled-for provocations will be dealt with swiftly and harshly."

FEARS CONSEQUENCES

If schoolchildren who engage in a fist fight or other disorderly conduct at school are not to be punished by school authorities, a juvenile court, or other State tribunal, but are to be arrested by the FBI and without trial by jury are to be sentenced by a United States district judge for violation of an injunction, I fear the consequences in districts where the races are evenly divided.

In the Tennessee school of 804 pupils, only 14 are Negroes. In the school district in South Carolina where there originated the case decided by the Supreme Court, the school population is 2,900 Negroes and 290 white students. There are many such districts in the South and they present a far more serious problem than the situation in Clinton.

In Tennessee a man was sentenced by the district judge to imprisonment for 1 year and a fine of \$10,000 for making a speech which the judge regarded as inciting people to violation of the injunction and to acts of violence. That individual was not a citizen of Tennessee or any Southern State.

The facts of the case I do not know. But, law-abiding southerners do not encourage or condone acts of violence. If a white man from a northern State comes South and does incite white people to violence, he should be regarded with the same disfavor as the professional agitator from the North who comes to incite our colored neighbors to acts of violence. In our midst, we have trouble makers in both races. They need no assistance from other States.

The southern people know the United States Government has the military power to enforce the orders of its courts. They say, however, that the Supreme Court which ordered this experiment in sociology must enforce it. It cannot expect the States to voluntarily enforce a decision they regard as having no basis in the Constitution or any statute.

When they are criticized by some of the metropolitan press, they recall that only a few decades ago the Constitution was lawfully amended in the manner provided in that instrument and prohibition laws were enacted. Unquestionably, that was the law of the land. Many of the present critics of the South strongly urged the nullification of the prohibition laws. They made it fashionable to carry whisky flasks and boasted of distilling gin in bath tubs. They did not cease fighting for nullification until the 18th amendment was repealed.

The Supreme Court did not create the people of the United States. The people created the Supreme Court. And the people gave to Congress in article IV of the Constitution, the specific power to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of that Court.

Congress should exercise that power. It should deny to the Supreme Court the power to invalidate the provisions of a State constitution affecting public schools or affecting the security of the State or the United States Government.

LEGISLATION NEEDED

In view of the judicial threat to take out of the Constitution, through the injunctive process, the guaranty of trial of all crimes by a jury, Congress, by legislation, should protect the people against judicial abuse of the power in injunction.

Heretofore when a man has been charged with a felony and has pleaded "not guilty" he has said he would be tried "by God and my country." We must make certain that a man charged with committing a crime, as well as violating a judicial order, is not forced to plead that he will be tried—not by God or his country—but, by a United States district judge.

One could not discuss this segregation decision without admitting that entirely apart from the legal phases, there is a fundamen-

tal objection by the people of the South to the social experiment of the Supreme Court.

They fear the purpose of many of those advocating integration in schools is to break down social barriers in the period of adolescence and ultimately bring about intermarriage of the races. They are opposed to this and they are determined to resist in every legal way the efforts to mix the races in the schools. This is not petty prejudice. It is a serious problem of race relations.

Pride of race has been responsible for the grouping of people along ethnic lines throughout the world. Race preservation is the explanation of the political unrest and race tension in South Africa.

Pride of race as well as loyalty to religion, contributes to the conflict between Jews and Arabs in the Middle East, which today threatens the peace of the world. Jews do not marry Arabs. Several Arab governments will not even allow a Jew to enter those countries.

It was a realization of the wisdom of segregating races that prompted 46 governments, including the United States, to agree in the Geneva Convention of 1929 that "Belligerents shall, so far as possible, avoid assembling in a single camp prisoners of different races or nationalities."

In the United States, pride of race is not confined to the South. Today in 23 States, intermarriage of the races is prohibited by law. The degree of race tension in various States and communities is dependent upon the percentage of Negro population.

In the mountainous areas of the South there are few Negroes and little tension. There are other areas where the races are more evenly divided. There the race problem is acute and is the principal topic of conversation among all classes of people.

Similarly, in Northern States in the rural areas there is little tension while in the great cities of New York, Detroit, Washington, and Chicago there is increasing tension.

It is useless for men to argue whether the racial instinct is right or wrong—it exists. It is nothing new.

Thomas Jefferson, the patron saint of the Democratic Party, when he was nearly 80 years of age, said "Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government. Nature, habit, opinion, have drawn indelible lines of distinction between them."

Abraham Lincoln, who signed the Emancipation Proclamation, and has been regarded as the patron saint of the Republican Party, said in his joint debate with Douglas, at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, 1858, "I will say then that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not, nor ever have been in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say, in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I believe will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality." * * *

The prophecies of these two statesmen were made a century ago. In the early days, following the war, the people of other sections showed no great interest in educating the recently freed slaves. The problem of helping him educationally and economically was left to the impoverished people of the South. They so generously did what they thought was right, now they can boast that since the days of reconstruction the Negro in the South has made greater progress than he has made in any country of the world.

PROGRESS CITED

I am proud of their progress in South Carolina. They are in all the professions. Some few are engaged in banking, hundreds in in-

surance and real estate. They are engaged in merchandising, farming, and in the skilled trades. They own radio stations. More than 18,000 own their own farms. Others manage farms. Thousands own their homes which are equipped with television and electrical refrigeration.

With a Negro population of approximately 800,000 Negroes, about 140,000 own automobiles.

I am confident the number of automobiles owned by Negroes in South Carolina is greater than the number of automobiles privately owned in Russia with its population of 200 million.

As a result of the educational program which I sponsored while Governor, there is at least one Negro high school in every school district. Because these schools are new, in most instances they are better than the high schools for white pupils.

In the State we have 7,500 Negro school-teachers. In New York City with a larger Negro population, less than 5 percent of the regular teachers are Negroes.

For the State of Illinois with a Negro population of approximately 700,000, I do not have the figures, but I am certain the number of Negro teachers is not one-half the 7,500 in South Carolina.

Proud as I am of this progress, I am even prouder that in the last 25 years there has been a vastly improved relation between the races.

Because this is true, the decision of the Supreme Court was a tragedy. It has undone all that men of good will in both races had accomplished in improving race relations. Instead of improving the situation is worsening. Now we fear for the future.

In the cities, where Negro homes are concentrated, schools were built near their homes. Students are assigned to the schools nearest their homes. If, however, a district judge insists on disregarding State assignment laws and orders the mixing of the races in the schools, I fear the American people will have as serious a problem in the Southeast as we now have in the Midwest.

In several States laws have been enacted providing that if by order of any court, State or Federal, a student is assigned to a school different from that to which he is assigned by school officials, all appropriations for the school to which that student is assigned and all appropriations for the school from which he comes, shall immediately cease.

Counsel for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People predict the Supreme Court will declare these laws unconstitutional. I do not think so, but in view of the segregation decision, I would not bet on what the Court would do.

MAY CLOSE PUBLIC SCHOOL

However, I predict that if the Court shall declare unconstitutional all State statutes having in its opinion the effect of continuing segregation, then with great regret, many States will discontinue public schools.

In anticipation of this last resort, provisions in State constitutions requiring appropriations for public schools have been repealed by the voters. Private schools will be preferred to integrated schools.

Of one thing I am confident, should the Supreme Court cause the closing of public schools, leaders of the white race in the South will see to it that the innocent Negro children receive an education. They must not be permitted to suffer because of the well-intentioned but misguided efforts of overzealous do-gooders.

In South Carolina a similar law was passed as to recreation parks. There are parks for both races. When a suit was brought by several Negroes to be admitted to a park set aside for white people, the legislature passed a law closing that park. A United States district judge recently held the question of dis-

crimination was moot because the park was closed.

The people do not feel as keenly about integration in parks as in schools. Recreation is desirable, but education is essential. However, law officers believed that with the existing tension, integration in parks where there are cabins for lodging and swimming pools, was dangerous.

Governors of several States have announced they will not follow the Tennessee example and call out the National Guard to escort Negro children to white schools. They take the position, taken by the Governor of Texas, that under the police powers, it is the duty of a governor to quell disorders, not to cause them.

In its decision, the Supreme Court said that segregation would retard the development of Negro children. It did not comment upon the effect integration would have upon the development of white children. We believe the presence of troops and tanks and the secret police at a school will do great psychological harm to children—white and colored. Instead of thinking of mathematical problems, they will think of race problems.

The people of the South are not an alien people. They are loyal Americans. Whatever may have been the differences between the North and South 100 years ago, in the Spanish-American War southerners proved their devotion to the United States. In World War I and again in World War II they demonstrated their patriotism and their courage on the battlefields of the world.

Today they are overwhelmed by this problem of race which was inherited by them more than a century ago. Through the years that cross has borne heavily upon them.

Now they earnestly appeal to you for understanding, as they pray that their burdens may be lessened, if not lifted.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON AIRPOWER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed at the present time, if morning business is concluded, to the consideration of the resolution of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], which was made the unfinished business last evening. I refer to Order No. 66, which is Senate Resolution 93.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be laid before the Senate automatically upon the completion of morning business.

If there is no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 93) authorizing the printing of a Senate document of the report on an investigation of airpower, and providing for additional copies.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I do not know whether the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] cares to make any observations in connection with the consideration of the resolution or not. If he does, this is the appropriate time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I might say that there is an extreme shortage of the report. There are not available a sufficient number of copies to supply Members of Congress. The price of publishing 5,000 more copies is only \$600.

Therefore, I ask that the resolution be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed as a Senate document the report of an investigation of airpower by the Subcommittee on the Air Force of the Committee on Armed Services, United States Senate; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for use of the Committee on Armed Services.

CITATION OF FRANK W. BREWSTER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 58, Senate Resolution 92, a resolution citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate. I call this request to the attention of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 92) citing Frank W. Brewster for contempt of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 92), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Frank W. Brewster—

(1) to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations;

(2) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of the Western Conference of Teamsters before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations; and

(3) to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Joint Council 28, of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers,

said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Frank W. Brewster may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 16, 17, 18, and 19, the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, began the holding of hearings pursuant to a preliminary investigation the committee had been conducting for some time, looking into conditions that prevail in certain areas of labor and management relations.

At that time we had before us the Secretary of Labor; also, the chairman of the National Labor Relations Board; and a representative of the Treasury Department, I believe Mr. Winkle.

We took testimony from those witnesses regarding the problems of Government in those areas, particularly with respect to existing law, and to what extent those agencies of Government could check against the accuracy of reports and financial statements that labor organizations are required to file with the Government under the law before they can receive the advantage of the services of the National Labor Relations Board and other benefits provided by law.

We found, Mr. President, that their authority in that area is quite limited and quite restricted. We found that what we had ascertained was possibly true, namely, that in some areas some unions were not filing truthful and accurate reports of their financial transactions, and that the Government was being imposed upon by the setting up of what is known as paper unions that had not complied with the law. We found that the officers of the governmental agencies involved had no authority, according to their interpretation of the law, to take any action other than simply to issue certificates or letters of compliance, and also to make available the services the law provides, notwithstanding that the information supplied by some unions in their reports was inaccurate, false, and known to be false, and was intended to constitute an imposition upon the Government.

We also had found, Mr. President, that certain racketeering practices were going on in areas where the Federal Government was procuring goods in the nature of military uniforms and other clothing, and that the racketeering was having an impact upon the cost to the Government of those goods, also resulting, in some instances, in goods being supplied which were inferior to those contracted for.

Our investigation extended to the west coast, to the teamsters union. There it became desirable to hear witnesses from certain labor organizations; and also to hear some witnesses from labor unions in New York.

Mr. Brewster is president of what is known as the Western Conference of Teamsters, a group of labor organizations comprising locals in 11 of the Western States. Mr. Brewster was subpoenaed before the committee to testify. He was subpoenaed to testify and also to produce certain records of the Western Conference, as well as the records of a certain teamsters' local—Joint Council 28 of the Teamsters in Seattle, I believe, of which he is president.

The subpoenas were duly served. Mr. Brewster appeared and took the position that the committee had no jurisdiction of him or of the records, or of the subject matter into which the committee was inquiring. Therefore he refused to answer any questions propounded to him by any member of the committee. He stood upon that challenge of the jurisdiction of the committee.

The committee, under the rules of the Senate, is charged with the duty of studying government at all levels, with a view to determining its efficiency and economy. That is the overall duty with which this committee is charged. It is the position of the committee that it would be derelict in its responsibility if,

having information that the practices which I have described prevailed in any union or in any area of the country, it did not inquire into them.

Therefore the issue is joined. This committee will be useless hereafter to the United States Senate if this challenge of its authority and its jurisdiction is sustained.

It is not a challenge merely to the committee. It is a challenge to the United States Senate. It is a defiance of the authority of the United States Senate to determine the facts, through this committee, which has the overall duty and responsibility of policing Government agencies. It is a defiance of this committee and of the authority of the Senate to inquire whether certain labor officials, who have the duty under the law enacted by Congress to file truthful statements of their financial and other activities, have done so.

There is involved a challenge to the authority of the committee to inquire into whether or not labor officials are honestly complying with the law, or whether they are evading the law and committing an imposition upon the Government, and thus Government in this respect is inefficient, and whether remedial legislation is needed.

That is the issue, and I trust the Senate will uphold its committee in the action it has taken. I may say that not only did the subcommittee unanimously recommend this action, but it has been unanimously approved by the full Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to my good friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As one who once had the honor of serving on this very committee under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Arkansas, I assure him that I will certainly vote to uphold his committee.

I should like to state further that some time ago I noticed that a district Federal judge undertook to hold that a witness could not be in contempt of a congressional committee unless the rules of the Senate provided almost explicitly for the investigation of the particular item involved.

In other words, if a question were somewhat irrelevant, or merely parallel to the investigation, and if it were sought to obtain information which might not have been specifically requested by the Senate, the witness could not be held in contempt. I am frank to say that, as a Member of the legislative branch, I personally resent having any Federal judge attempt to strip the legislative branch of the power granted to it by the Constitution. I urge Members of this body not to confirm, in the future, the nomination of judges who take such a view.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in my judgment, if a challenge could be sustained against the power of the Senate to investigate, it could be sustained against the power of the Congress to legislate. I think that is fundamental.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to congratulate the Senator from Arkansas for his statement. I think he is doing very fine work for the American people.

I am one of the so-called liberals in the United States Senate. I have always tried to be for labor. However, there have been instances in which labor did not follow proper practices. There is no reason why the challenge by any group, or any individuals within a group, of the authority of the committee to inquire as to what is going on, should prevail. I congratulate the Senator. I say this as a friend of labor. I think the Senator from Arkansas is doing a great thing for labor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that I agree with his committee's conclusion that in this troubled and very small world it is imperatively necessary that his committee have the support he seeks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator very much.

I wish to point out one thing more. I spoke of the duty and responsibility of the committee with respect to studying Government on all levels, with a view to determining its efficiency and economy. The committee is also charged with the duty, after having made such studies, to make recommendations to the Senate with respect to legislation which may be needed to improve the economy and efficiency of the Government.

I may say that there is an area here in which, if the present interpretation of existing statutes is correct, very definitely further legislation is needed in order to remedy some conditions the committee has already found to exist, particularly the condition into which it was inquiring at the time this witness testified.

I am ready for the question to be submitted, unless other Senators wish to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 92) was agreed to.

CITATION OF NUGENT LAPOMA FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 89) citing Nugent LaPoma (alias George Cavano) for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 89), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Nugent LaPoma,

also known as George Cavano, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations; to produce certain papers consisting of described books and records of Local 174 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, said refusal to answer and to produce the aforementioned papers being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Nugent LaPoma may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the remarks I have made on the general premise of the authority and jurisdiction of the committee with respect to the previous resolution are applicable to the resolution now under consideration. Mr. LaPoma is secretary-treasurer of local 174 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers, at Seattle, Wash.

A subpoena was duly served on him, and also a subpoena duces tecum, to present certain records of the local for the committee's inspection. Mr. LaPoma refused to deliver the records in response to the subpoena. He also refused to testify, or to answer questions, saying he would give no information to the committee. Therefore, without laboring the matter further, this resolution involves the same issue which was involved in the resolution previously agreed to. I am ready for the question, unless some Senators wish to be heard on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution (S. Res. 89) was agreed to.

CITATION OF EINAR O. MOHN FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 60, Senate Resolution 91.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 91) citing Einar O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 91), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Einar O. Mohn, to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations, pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Einar O. Mohn may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the pending resolution would cite Mr. Einar

O. Mohn for contempt of the Senate. Mr. Mohn is vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, with headquarters in Washington, D. C. At the time he was also acting for the general president of the organization.

He was subpoenaed before the committee to testify particularly with respect to a telegram he sent to 12 vice presidents of the international union throughout the country. The telegram was calculated to obstruct and impede the work of the committee, and it was also calculated to encourage witnesses to be in contempt of the committee.

Among other things, after stating the fact that the committee was making its investigation and had subpoenaed a number of witnesses and documents and a number of officials of the union and documents of the union, the telegram stated:

4. If any member, officer, or representative of the international or any of its affiliates, after advice of counsel, should assert his constitutional or legal privileges or rights, the assertion of said rights or privileges shall not be the basis for disciplinary proceedings by or within the international.

Mr. President, Mr. Mohn was called before the committee by subpoena to testify with respect to having sent this telegram, and he was also interrogated about other matters which were a part of the subject of the committee's inquiry. Mr. Mohn challenged the jurisdiction of the committee, refused to testify, and refused to acknowledge whether he had sent the telegram, although it bore his signature, or to deny whether he sent it.

Mr. President, that was definitely a defiance and contempt of the United States Senate. His other actions were calculated to impede and hinder, if not completely to obstruct, the investigation then underway.

Therefore, Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to be heard, I ask that the question be put on the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution (S. Res. 91) was agreed to.

CITATION OF HARRY REISS FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar 61, Senate Resolution 90.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 90) citing Harry Reiss for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 90), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Harry Reiss to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations, per-

tinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Harry Reiss may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this is a case similar to the one the Senate has just disposed of.

Mr. Harry Reiss is administrator of the welfare fund of local 227 and is also an official of the Teamsters' Union. He was called before the committee to testify regarding information he had which was of interest to the committee concerning the conduct of Teamsters' Local 227, particularly in its relations to the Federal Government in connection with statements or other reports which the law requires to be filed. The witness refused to admit that he was a member of the union and refused to answer any questions whatsoever. He was definitely in defiance and in contempt of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the statements I made with respect to the resolution of contempt against Mr. Brewster apply equally to each one of these cases.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that the question be put on the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 90) was agreed to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief announcement. The policy committee is about to hold a meeting, and I propose to ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Resolution 75, at this time, if there will be no extended discussion on it, because I wish to make a brief statement on a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution concerning the Middle East situation.

If the Senator from Alabama is ready to explain Senate Resolution 75, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 67, Senate Resolution 75.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 75) to authorize additional clerk-hire for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 75), which is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is authorized, from February 1, 1957, through January 31, 1958, to employ four additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e), as amended, of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and the provisions of Public Law 4, 80th Congress, approved February 19, 1947, as amended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Rules and Administration. It simply continues the employment of four stenographers on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who were originally employed in the 83d Congress, whose services were continued in the 84th Congress, and whose services are now needed by the Committee on Public Welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

SENATOR CARL HAYDEN, OF ARIZONA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the other day I happened to read that on February 19, 1957, CARL HAYDEN will have served in Congress for 45 years.

A modest man is CARL HAYDEN. I do not see him on the floor now, but Senators know that he is busily at work in the rooms of the Committee on Appropriations. As chairman of that committee, which carries the heaviest load of any committee in the Congress, and as President pro tempore of the Senate, no one is busier than he.

But it seemed to me that this day ought not to go by without it being noted that it marks the anniversary of the commencement of the longest period of congressional service by any present Member of the Congress of the United States.

I came to know CARL HAYDEN when I was a Member of the House of Representatives and was serving on the Committee on Conference on the Committee on Appropriations, representing the House. The first time I went into a conference with him, I did not know who he was, but by the time the conference was completed, I was eager to ask someone what the background of that man was, because he seemed to have the answer to everything when a time came for a showdown.

Some years ago a man said to me that he thought CARL HAYDEN knew more about the Government of the United States than did any other individual. I have never been disposed to take exception to that observation. Nor have I been disposed to take exception to the observation of another friend, who said he thought that, if anyone knew how to get something done in Congress, it was the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

In looking at the Congressional Directory, a few minutes ago, I noted that the biographical sketch of CARL HAYDEN is only seven lines long. It reads as follows:

CARL HAYDEN, Democrat, Phoenix; born Hayden's Ferry (now Tempe), Ariz., October 2, 1877; educated in public schools of Tempe, Normal School of Arizona, and Stanford University; delegate Democratic National Convention 1904; elected treasurer Maricopa County 1904, sheriff 1906, reelected 1908; appointed major of infantry, United States National Army, October 4, 1918; married; elected to 62d and succeeding Congresses through 69th; elected to United States Senate 1926; reelected 1932, 1938, 1944, 1950, and 1956.

One who is not familiar with the history of Congress or with how Congress operates would never glean from that sketch all that would be necessary to understand the ability of Senator HAYDEN, his character, and the high confidence which he enjoys on the part of the other Members of this body.

Going further into the general Biographical Directory of the American Congress (1774-1949), I find that upon the admission of Arizona as a State into the Union, on February 14, 1912, CARL HAYDEN was elected to Congress as Representative at Large and took his seat on February 19, 1912. That is 45 years ago today. The well-remembered Champ Clark, of Missouri, was Speaker of the House of Representatives at the time. Arizona's first two Senators were Henry F. Ashurst and Marcus A. Smith, and they did not take their seats until April 2, 1912.

CARL HAYDEN does not make long speeches on the floor of the Senate, but he always speaks to the subject at hand, briefly and effectively. I have wondered at times if he originated the saying that it is much better to have people wonder why you do not speak than to wonder why you do. When he does speak, Senators know that he speaks with accuracy and authority, so they listen with interest.

Mr. President, I do not desire to make an extended speech, but I did wish to say a few words on this anniversary occasion in tribute to a man who has served in Congress longer than any other Member and served with so much distinction as has the senior Senator from Arizona, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to observe that the majority policy committee toasted the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the senior Senator from Arizona, CARL HAYDEN.

He is one of the great men of the Senate, always kindly, always gentle, always a genuine friend. I know of no more effective public servant in public life today than CARL HAYDEN.

I am informed that this is the anniversary of 45 years of continuous service by CARL HAYDEN in Congress. That period has been exceeded only one time in the history of Congress, namely, by the late Representative Adolph Sabath, of Illinois, who served approximately 45 years and 9 months.

So Senator HAYDEN not only is the sole living person who holds such a distinguished record, but his is second to the alltime record established for congressional service.

Mr. President, it is typical of CARL HAYDEN that he would refuse to come to the Senate Chamber to hear his friends pay tribute to him. He is a man of great modesty and great understanding. The people of Arizona, the people of the Nation, and the Members of Congress are indeed fortunate to have had the benefit of his service throughout the years, and look forward to many more years of vigorous and able service by him.

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 63, Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before the question is put, I desire to make a very brief statement. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], will make an extended statement explaining the joint resolution; but because I must be away from the Chamber, I should like at this time to make a statement which will take about 3 minutes before the motion is acted upon.

There are a few observations I wish to make on the resolution so that the character of our actions, as I see them, will be entirely clear to all the world.

Throughout my public career, I have consistently held to the belief that an American foreign policy is best made through responsible cooperation. By that I mean cooperation not only between the two parties, but also between Congress and the executive.

This is not always a simple concept to follow. Sometimes there is an understandable disposition upon the part of one branch or the other to operate on a "put up or shut up" basis.

Sometimes there is a tendency to define cooperation as "do it my way or else."

But, Mr. President, responsible cooperation does not flow along those lines. It is not merely a matter of the executive proposing and of Congress either rubberstamping the proposal or acting like a dog in the manger.

Every realistic man, I believe, will recognize that the President of the United States has a very special role to play in the field of foreign policy. He is charged by the Constitution specifically with the conduct of foreign policy of the United States. He is the custodian of the day-to-day information without which no policy can be made.

But Congress also has a special responsibility. It is our task to examine the actions of the Executive; to obtain the facts; and to approve, reject, or make the changes which are dictated by the standards of wisdom and prudence.

The third course is the one which was followed by the committees that considered the resolution.

The resolution came to us under somewhat uncertain circumstances. We first heard about it through a third party. But perhaps this was simply because communications between the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue were a bit weak.

The Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, held several days of hearings. We listened to the testimony of many expert witnesses. There were some allegations that some of the witnesses spoke at length but testified to very little.

I will not pursue those allegations beyond saying that I could detect some disposition to take a long time explaining answers to very simple questions. But at the conclusion of the hearings the committees went into executive session and began to work on the joint resolution.

First, the committees discovered that there was no definite date for the termination of the economic aid proposed in the joint resolution. The Department, through the Secretary of State, said that it had no objection to a terminal date, but that somehow it had not been included.

At the suggestion of the very able, very distinguished, very thorough, and prudent senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], that deficiency was corrected.

Then the committees discovered that the authors of the measure were asking for a blank check, and could not tell us then precisely how, where, and when the money would be spent. They said this information would be available later, after the Richards mission had made a tour, a survey, and a report.

At my initiative, an amendment was adopted; and under the present language of the joint resolution as it was reported by the committees, Congress will have an opportunity to examine the projects 15 days before they are finally approved. Before any allocations become final, they must be submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress.

Finally, it became apparent that the joint resolution raised grave questions about the constitutional relationships between the President and Congress. It was difficult to determine who was the Commander in Chief and who had the power to declare war. The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] prepared an amendment to correct this weakness; and their language, in my opinion, did not water down or did not weaken the joint resolution by a comma. The joint resolution still remains a clear warning to the Communist aggressors: Keep out.

Mr. President, the joint resolution represents to me the true meaning of

responsible cooperation in the field of foreign policy. The President advanced a proposal; a coordinate branch of the Government—and I am now specifically speaking of the great committees presided over by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], namely, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services—considered the proposal at length and wrote in changes which the members deemed wise.

Now—and this is of more than passing significance—the President and the Secretary of State have indicated their willingness to accept the proposed legislation as it has been reported by two committees sitting jointly.

This type of operation, in my opinion, is one which strengthens a policy. It serves notice to the Communist world that it is opposed not simply by one man, not simply by one branch of the Government of the United States. It serves notice that the Communist world is opposed by the institutions representing the united will of the American people.

It is in that spirit that I am approaching the joint resolution. I do not claim that it is perfect. Far from it. But I do believe that it represents balanced judgment and that we can consider it responsibly and in something other than a "yes" or "no" attitude; in something other than a black or white situation.

The joint resolution has been considered expeditiously, but not hastily. It is subject to further consideration, which I am confident the Senate will give it in the same vein. I believe it represents a tremendous improvement over the original joint resolution. In that spirit we can go ahead and can demonstrate that in the defense of our Nation, and against Communist aggression, all Americans are united.

Mr. President, I wish to state for the record some statistics in regard to the troops-to-Europe proposal. The troops-to-Europe proposal was pending before the appropriate committees for 50 days. It was reported to the Senate, and the Senate debated that proposal for 20 days. I do not mean to imply that that situation is comparable to the present one; but for purposes of comparison it does show that in the present case the combined committees have functioned with efficiency, thoroughness, and dispatch. I trust that the entire Senate will do likewise, and that we shall improve on the record set in the other situation.

Mr. President, I desire to express my gratitude to and my commendation of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for the painstaking care which he exercised in the consideration of the joint resolution, for his unfailing courtesy to every member of the committees, and for the great ability and wisdom he demonstrated throughout the consideration of this measure.

All of us are likewise indebted to our friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], for the contributions he has made. There is no abler Member of the Senate. The Senate is fortunate to have such distin-

guished Senators working on the joint resolution.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 19.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, jointly, with an amendment to strike out the preamble and all after the resolving clause, and insert:

That the President be and hereby is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance. Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the charter of the United Nations.

SEC. 3. The President is hereby authorized to use during the balance of fiscal year 1957 for economic and military assistance under this joint resolution not to exceed \$200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, in accord with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That, whenever the President determines it to be important to the security of the United States, such use may be under the authority of section 401 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and without regard to the provisions of section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957: *Provided further*, That obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations for military assistance, and obligations incurred in carrying out the purposes of the first section of this joint resolution shall be paid only out of appropriations other than those for military assistance. This authorization is in addition to other existing authorizations with respect to the use of such appropriations. None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, from which the funds are proposed to be derived: *Provided*,

That funds available under this section during the balance of fiscal year 1957 shall, in the case of any such report submitted during the last 15 days of the fiscal year, remain available for use under this section for the purposes stated in such report for a period of 20 days following the date of submission of such report. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed as itself authorizing the appropriation of additional funds for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the first section or of the first sentence of section 2 of this joint resolution.

Sec. 4. The President shall, within the months of January and July of each year, report to the Congress his action hereunder.

Sec. 5. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

IMPORTANCE OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, all of us appreciate that Senate Joint Resolution 19 is probably the most important foreign policy measure to come before the Senate at this session of Congress. On January 5 the President of the United States took the extraordinary step of addressing a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives relative to the situation in the Middle East. The President asked that Congress join with him in expressing the determination of the United States to assist those nations of the Middle East which desire our assistance against the menace of international communism. Secretary of State Dulles and other representatives of the executive branch subsequently appeared before a joint committee consisting of members of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, to justify in detail the President's request. This joint committee, over which I had the honor to preside, has now made its report. It strongly supports the policy announced by the President of using armed forces, if necessary, to help nations of the Middle East resist Communist aggression.

The importance of Senate Joint Resolution 19 has been further emphasized by two reactions from the Communist quarter. We know from experience that the Russians tend to make the most noise when their position is the least tenable. On last January 18 the Governments of the Soviet Union and Communist China issued a belligerent declaration on the subject of the Middle East policy of the United States. On last February 12, 1957, the Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union presented to the United States Ambassador in Moscow a 6-point proposal with respect to the Middle East.

I shall not discuss the merit or lack of merit of either of these moves on the part of the Communists. I cite them simply to show the importance which the Communist world attaches to the declaration of Middle East policy which the United States is now in the process of making.

COMMITTEE ACTION

Mr. President, I can safely say that the joint resolution now before the Senate has been given thorough consideration during 16 days of joint committee meet-

ings. Secretary Dulles was before the committee for 6 full days, and Admiral Radford was questioned on 2 days. The joint committee spent 5 days questioning 5 present and former United States Ambassadors to countries in the Middle East. A large number of private individuals and representatives from American organizations presented their views. Three Senators who were not members of the joint committee presented their views.

I wish to pay high tribute to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, who sat with me faithfully and helpfully during the long days of hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 19.

I call the attention of Senators to report No. 70, before them, which contains many details on the Middle East resolution, which I shall not repeat in my remarks.

Mr. President, I introduced the executive branch joint resolution on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], with the explanation that I reserved my right to support amendments which I thought might improve the joint resolution. Such amendments have now been made. As a result, the joint resolution is now a far better one.

The most important amendment concerned the language relating to the possible use of United States Armed Forces in the general area of the Middle East. Senate Joint Resolution 19 as originally introduced contained these words:

He [the President] is authorized to employ the Armed Forces of the United States as he deems necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism.

The new language adopted by the joint committee reads as follows:

The United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

The critical change in this language, Mr. President, is that which avoids use of the words "he is authorized," and substitutes for them the statement that in the circumstances specified "the United States is prepared to use armed forces * * *"

It is my view that this change immensely strengthens the language originally proposed by the President. I so informed the Secretary of State when I discussed this change with him after the joint committee had acted. I am pleased to know that the President of the United States has concurred in this view.

This new language is stronger than that in the original resolution because it states not simply that the President "is authorized," but it declares the policy of the United States. It is much more clear and forthright to state that

the "United States is prepared" to take action, than to state only that the President is authorized. The revised language substitutes the whole Government for the Executive branch alone. Furthermore, as the report of the joint committee states, this language has the "virtue" of avoiding a constitutional debate which might have the effect of getting an important foreign policy statement lost in a lengthy discussion of constitutional interpretation.

I do not want to be understood as belittling in any respect the important constitutional questions which were raised by the use of the words "is authorized" in the original resolution. My sole point is that there was great danger that lengthy and profound discussion of constitutional questions might have had the effect of reducing the impact of an important statement of United States policy in an area vital to the security interest of this Nation. Until the joint committee spoke, and until the Secretary of State and the President accepted this new language, there was great danger that the fog of constitutional discussion might blur the new vistas which a forthright statement of our intentions should open up. We are now ready to develop a strong, affirmative Middle East policy designed to preserve the independence of states in that area—states whose independence is vital to us.

I want also to mention an amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] which has made it clear that no new programs are to be inaugurated pursuant to section 3 of the resolution without the submission of a report by the President to the appropriate committees prior to the inauguration of such programs. Several amendments by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] have clarified clauses relating to economic and military assistance.

THE SENATE IS NO RUBBERSTAMP

Mr. President, there are several important lessons to be learned from our experience thus far in considering the resolution which is now before the Senate. These are lessons to be applied in the future if our foreign policy is to be strong, and serve the interests of a united people.

In the first place, it seems to me that it is a mistake for the executive branch of the Government to submit legislative proposals to the Congress and expect Congress to accept every dotted "i" and crossed "t" and to view any changes as defeats. Our discussions in the joint committee indicated that there was widespread and general support for the policies enunciated by the President in his message to us of January 5. But there was also evidence that the administration was too enamored of its own legislative draftsmanship. Most amendments suggested by Senators were rejected by the executive branch quickly and unequivocally, with little evidence that they had received the sympathetic consideration which they deserved. It is time for the executive branch of the Government to recognize that in the field of foreign policy the Senate has never been, and never will be, a rubber stamp.

It is the duty of the President to submit his foreign policy proposals to the Congress. But it is likewise the duty of the Congress to measure those proposals independently, not only with respect to policy, but also with respect to the constitutional implications of those proposals.

This we have done. The product will elicit a wider area of public agreement and acceptance than would the original language of the resolution. The changes made by the joint committee should not be viewed as a defeat for the Executive; they should be viewed as a triumph for our system of separation of powers—a separation which must be preserved if our freedoms are to be safeguarded.

I wish that it were possible to make public some of the debate which took place in the markup sessions of the joint committee. Some of the most profound constitutional discussion in which I have ever been my privilege to participate took place in those sessions. It was a deep privilege for me to preside over those sessions, and I want to take this occasion to thank all my colleagues for their understanding and their hard work.

I can state unequivocally that our meetings in joint session brought together in one room, for a period of nearly 4 weeks, one of the greatest aggregations of United States foreign and military policy experience that has ever been gathered in the Senate. The cumulative experience, judgment, and wisdom of the members of the joint committee was most impressive. The fact that our constitutional system provides opportunity for this kind of judgment and evaluation of presidential proposals assures the American people that the foreign policies affecting the life of this Nation are formulated only after most careful and thorough consideration. Let me repeat again, it is this kind of study that protects our American heritage.

NONPARTISANSHIP

Another lesson to be learned from our committee discussions of this resolution relates to the subject of nonpartisanship. It is with some reluctance that I enter into this subject, which was ably discussed on the floor last week by the senior Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY]. But what I am about to say needs saying now if we are to avoid injecting undue partisanship into the formulation of foreign policy—a situation I shall do my utmost to avoid.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, a number of the votes on amendments in the joint committee found members voting along party lines. I do not like this. I do not think most members like it. They were as uneasy and as disturbed as I was.

We must never forget that partisanship breeds partisanship. Tight party lines on one side of the aisle, partisan-motivated attack or defense of foreign policy, will only harden partisan divisions, to the detriment of a strong foreign policy supported by a united people.

The national interest requires that this kind of voting come to an end in the field of foreign policy. There is no higher duty imposed on Members of this

body than to exercise independent judgment in the field of foreign policy. It is essential in this area of national policy to put the principle of independent judgment above party regularity.

I say this to members of both parties in the Congress, as well as to members of both parties serving in the executive branch of the Government.

As I have said, it is proper, under our Constitution, for the executive branch of the Government to exercise leadership in the field of foreign policy. But that leadership should be nonpartisan. There should be no occasion in this critical field for party regularity—for whipping the party into line, as the phrase goes.

It may be possible once or twice for partisan action to succeed. But in the end, partisanship in foreign policy, whether it originates in the Executive or in the Congress, can only lead to shattering defeat not only for the proponents of such a policy, but for the policy pressed by this technique. Partisanship in foreign policy will hurt our Nation.

In this connection, I want to pay my highest compliments to the majority and minority leaders of this body. They have both shown their independent foreign policy judgment on many occasions. They have put their responsibilities as Senators above partisan pleading in the field of foreign policy. It is well known that on occasion the minority leader has disagreed on matters of principle with party leadership from the executive branch of the Government. It is equally well known that the majority leader has on occasion cooperated on matters of principle with the leadership in the executive branch, even though that leadership has been vested in representatives of the other party.

This kind of independence is to be commended—not independence for independence sake, but independence for the sake of being able to arrive at independent judgment. It is in the exercise of independent judgment that we find protection for our freedoms.

PUT MISTAKES BEHIND

We all realize that some mistakes have been made in the Middle East. I do not intend, however, to make a point of these errors. The past is over and done with and we must now review the situation as it stands today in the Middle East and take some thoughtful steps forward.

PURPOSE OF THE RESOLUTION

The purpose of Senate Joint Resolution 19 is to announce in no uncertain terms to the world that if the international Communist movement tries by force to expand its influence in the Middle East the United States would regard such an attempt as a threat to the security of the United States. The purpose of the resolution, at the same time, is to make clear to the sovereign nations of the Middle East that they are not alone in their effort to defend their independence and to make a better life for their people.

The resolution also makes clear that the United States wishes only to help, and has no desire to exercise any control in the Middle East. This resolution is

not a belligerent step; in fact, the joint committee has been informed at our hearings that no change in the present disposition of United States forces is contemplated; there are no plans to station additional United States forces in the Middle East; and no major change in the levels of military assistance to countries in the Middle East is expected.

Despite the clear statements of our intentions in the resolution, I am aware that there is a danger that countries such as Syria, Egypt, and Yemen may feel apprehensive by virtue of the fact that they alone in the Middle East have accepted Communist arms and Communist technicians. These countries need not be apprehensive about this resolution. The resolution does not threaten any nation in the Middle East. On the contrary, it is intended to extend a helping hand. The only warning contained in the resolution is directed toward international communism.

UNITED STATES INTEREST IN KEEPING THE MIDDLE EAST FREE

It is in the direct and vital interest of the United States that the nations of the Middle East maintain their independence. This interest and United States policies toward this end have been the basis for United States actions for many years.

The record of the United States in this respect stands in marked contrast to that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union for years has been proclaiming the independence of Hungary, but the world now knows that when the Hungarians seemed on the point of actually realizing some degree of independence the armed forces of the Soviet Union were sent in to crush the attempt.

Our friends and allies in Europe are very largely dependent on the oil of the Middle East for one of their primary energy sources. If the Communists controlled the oil of the Middle East they would be in a position to influence directly the course of events in Europe. But the oil of the Middle East also has importance for us because a very large proportion of the known reserves of the world is found there.

The Middle East is also important to the United States because of the location there of a number of airfields on which we depend, in part, for the defensive striking power which thus far has served as one of the important deterrents to Soviet aggression. We are permitted to use these airfields because we have come to agreement with the countries where they are located that such use is in their interest as well as in our own interest.

Another important interest of the United States in the Middle East is the Suez Canal. Like the oil of the Middle East, the Suez Canal is of importance to us chiefly in an indirect way. United States flag vessels do not make up a high percentage of the traffic through the canal, but the canal has been and will continue to be a vital line of communication and transportation for our friends both in Europe and in Asia.

Finally, the Middle East is important to the United States because of the raw materials which it contains and which we need.

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

The term "the general area of the Middle East" as used in this resolution covers a somewhat indefinite territory, and purposely so. It is not wise to draw a sharp line to separate the Middle East from adjacent areas. Suffice it to say that the general area of the Middle East includes countries all the way from Libya in the west to Pakistan in the east, and from Turkey in the north to the Sudan in the south.

It may be surprising to some to say that there is nothing wholly new in this resolution. The policies and principles embodied in it have been tested and found useful in many parts of the world. The resolution amounts primarily to a reaffirmation of United States policy with particular emphasis on this part of the world at this critical time. There is also a precedent in the similar Formosa Resolution which was enacted in 1955 for the declaration of intention to use United States Armed Forces to resist aggression. However, the language of the resolution now before the Senate represents, as I have said, a distinct improvement over that used in the Formosa Resolution.

References to economic and military assistance in the resolution are for the most part a reaffirmation of existing law. The only new element is contained in section 3. That section makes it possible for the President, with respect to funds already appropriated, to avoid, if need be, some of the procedures in existing law for the administration of the mutual security program. This additional flexibility is limited to not to exceed \$200 million of already appropriated funds. Besides this, the additional authority cannot be used until 15 days after the Congress has been informed as to the proposed use of the new authority. During this time the Congress will have the opportunity to review the proposed use and to register its opposition if the proposal does not seem to be wise.

The principal use to which the proposed new authority may be put by the President is the avoidance of the requirement contained in section 105 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1957, that not over 20 percent of mutual security appropriations may be spent in the last 2 months of the fiscal year. This additional leeway is necessary because, due to the recent fighting in the Middle East, our programs there have been badly interrupted in several countries.

It should be pointed out that there is nothing automatic about the commitment which we are undertaking in this resolution. If an emergency arises it will be dealt with by the President and the Congress according to our usual constitutional processes.

It is important also to point out that the resolution does not attempt to deal with all the problems which face us in the Middle East. This is only a first step. It is not intended to be a complete blueprint for progress in the Middle East. It concentrates on the danger from Communist aggression. It purposely does not deal with the danger from Communist subversion. The ways in which the United States can help

prevent Communist subversion do not involve the use of the Armed Forces. We resist Communist subversion by helping countries to stay independent and to develop their economies peacefully and democratically.

I wish to underline the fact that the resolution speaks only of a certain type of action in a particular set of circumstances. It is not meant to cover all the possible actions by the United States, and because it mentions some kinds of action it does not thereby limit or in any way affect other kinds of action by the United States in the Middle East or elsewhere.

We are aware now, more than ever before, of the importance of the Middle East, but this does not mean that our policies and objectives in other parts of the world have become less important.

IS THERE A VACUUM IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

It has become popular to say that there exists a vacuum in the Middle East. The reference is, of course, to the fact that there is for the time being understandable resentment against British and French influence in the area. The United States, however, has no intention of rushing to the Middle East to take the place of the British and French. We have no such ambition; we have no colonial pretensions or needs. If there is a vacuum in the Middle East, it is our hope that the vacuum will be filled by the people of the area themselves. It is the intention of the United States to help the people of the area maintain their independence and continue to handle their own affairs in the interest of their own people and in harmony with the rest of the world.

THE RESOLUTION IS NOT A PROGRAM

Senate Joint Resolution 19 constitutes both a warning to the Soviet Union and an assurance to the countries of the Middle East. These things are important, but they are by no means all that must be done. The major portion of our work lies ahead.

The Middle East has been a somewhat neglected area of our foreign policy. We need, and need quickly, a constructive, consistent policy and concrete program which will help the countries of the Middle East to live and grow in peace. We need not, incidentally, ask the countries of the Middle East to choose between the East and the West. They can be neutral if they wish. They must be independent. And it is to preserve that independence that the United States seeks to help these countries to see the dangers in communism. We should, on the other hand, welcome them as our allies if they so choose.

There are three immediate problems, obvious to all, which must be solved if there is to be much hope for the future in the Middle East.

The Suez Canal must be open to the traffic of all nations on some basis which will be fair both to them and to the host country—Egypt.

The long and bitter dispute between Israel and her Arab neighbors must come to an end. Any settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict will necessarily require concessions on both sides, and there are

such concessions which both sides can reasonably make.

Finally there remains to be solved the terrible condition of the Palestine refugees. The Government of the United States has long stood ready to help in the solution of the refugee problem, and we have done a great deal to provide the minimum subsistence on which the refugees now exist, but a permanent arrangement is something which lies entirely in the future.

The resolution before the Senate is not designed to help any country engage in an arms race. We have received the assurance of the Secretary of State that the new discretionary power which will be given to the President in section 3 will not be used to avoid the requirement of the Mutual Security Act that military assistance shall be made available solely to maintain the internal security and legitimate self-defense of the recipient nations consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

In calling on the executive branch to develop Middle East policies which will help achieve our peaceful objectives there, I must remind the Department of State of the evidence developed during the hearings of the joint committee that the State Department machinery and procedures have been at times extremely faulty. It is to be hoped that no more instances will come to light in which the United States Ambassador in a country in the Middle East will learn from the local newspapers of the announcement of United States policies of great concern to the country to which he is accredited.

TASKS FOR THE CONGRESS

Mr. President, in expressing the hope that the passage of this resolution may be the signal for renewed dedication on the part of the executive branch to constructive work in the Middle East, I should call attention to some of the work which the Congress must undertake on its own. First, we must insist that the executive branch develop constructive foreign policies. The Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services must insist on an adequate response by the executive branch to the request which we have made for documents and other materials which will provide a full and fair picture of United States involvement in the Middle East during the last several years. It is my hope that the executive branch will respond quickly to this request. We also expect to receive sufficient telegrams to and from United States Ambassadors in the field and other papers, so that we shall know the essential facts and policies with respect to the relations between this country and other countries during the period in question.

As evidence of the nonpartisan way in which this examination of the Middle East situation should be undertaken, I invite the attention of the administration to the fact that I have appointed a subcommittee, with equal representation from both parties, to assemble the material necessary to an objective evaluation of the situation.

The Senate should complete at an early date its study of the foreign aid

programs of the United States. A great deal of work in this field has already been done, and the special Senate committee created last year for this task has before it a number of fine studies on various aspects of the subject. It is my hope that the special committee will soon develop some helpful policy guidance for the future conduct of the mutual security program.

When the President's mutual security program for the fiscal year 1958 comes before the Congress later on in the year, the Senate should examine it even more carefully than usual and do so in the light of the principles which will be laid down by the Senate Special Committee To Study the Foreign Aid Program.

I think all the Members of this body must remain alert to the situation in the Middle East and demand of the executive branch all the information necessary to understand adequately the facts and the trends in that troubled area. We must exercise our surveillance function critically and helpfully.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THE
APPROVAL OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services, may I say that we have examined the Middle East resolution with great care. We have made judicious changes in the draft resolution which was referred to us. The joint committee believes that it is important for the United States to declare in this resolution that we shall not stand idly by in the event of Communist aggression in the Middle East. The joint committee also believes that we should assure the countries of the Middle East that we intend to conduct our affairs with a view to being of service to them as well as to the people of the United States. The joint committee has concluded that the Congress and the President should act together in stating these two important aspects of United States policy in the Middle East.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will approve Senate Joint Resolution 19.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the senior Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague for the valuable contribution he has made this afternoon and for the able manner in which he conducted the hearings held by the committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to join my distinguished colleague [Mr. PASTORE] in commending the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee not only for the way in which he conducted the joint hearings but for the very able presentation he has made on the floor this afternoon.

I am delighted that in the course of his remarks the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out that the changes made in the resolution during the course of the joint committee hearings, in effect, instead of weakening the resolution, strengthened it, and at the same time we have upheld the constitutional power of the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces.

I was particularly struck by the paragraph on page 5 of the Senator's speech which I desire to call to the attention of the Senate, and which I think deserves reading once again. I now read it:

In the first place, it seems to me that it is a mistake for the executive branch of this Government to submit legislative proposals to the Congress and expect Congress to accept every dotted "i" and crossed "t" and to view any changes as defeats. Our discussions in the joint committee indicated that there was widespread and general support for the policies enunciated by the President in his message to us of January 5. But there was also evidence that the administration was too enamored of its own legislative draftsmanship. Most amendments suggested by Senators were rejected by the executive branch quickly and unequivocally, with little evidence that they had received the sympathetic consideration which they deserved. It is time for the executive branch of the Government to recognize that in the field of foreign policy the Senate has never been and never will be a rubber stamp.

I am delighted that emphasis has been placed on this point, because, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations well knows, there were three resolutions offered, and on the basis of the report received from the State Department, it was clear that at best only a cursory glance had been given to the resolutions and no sympathetic consideration had been accorded them. They were offered in the spirit of trying to strengthen what the President proposed to do. They were offered in a spirit of responsibility.

Again, Mr. President, I wish to extend my thanks to our distinguished chairman for the fine work he did not only in the committee but on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as a member of the committee of which the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island is chairman I should like to congratulate him on the fair and impartial way in which he conducted the hearings. I also congratulate him on his splendid speech this afternoon, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing appreciation for the outstanding work which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island has done as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The public, the Congress, and the people of the world know far more about the proposed program because of the able and competent way in which all sides have been permitted to present their views during the course of the hearings. The Senator's speech clearly outlined, in terms which cannot be misunderstood, that the Senate will not yield its prerogative to look into and to consider all matters having to do with our foreign relations. I am personally very grateful to the Senator for the outstanding work which has been done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the manner in which he conducted the hearings and for what he has said today.

We were very happy that the Armed Services Committee was asked to join with the Foreign Relations Committee

to hear testimony on this important question. The hearings were conducted at great length, but in accord with the best traditions of the Senate, in order to get as much information as might be possible on the subject under discussion.

As one member of the Armed Services Committee on this side of the aisle, I should like to join with the Senator from Rhode Island in the expression of his understanding of the resolution, what it purports to do, and what we believe it will do for our Nation's security and for the peace of the world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the Senator from Rhode Island for the very able way in which he conducted the hearings. Although I did not vote with the Senator from Rhode Island on the final resolution, our difference over the substantive question has nothing to do with my great admiration of the Senator as chairman of the committee.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues for their kind words.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am in favor of the joint resolution recommended by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly.

The purpose of the resolution is to increase the opportunities for a more peaceful world by making a clear and forceful statement as to our position with regard to the dangers inherent in the disturbances now occurring in the general area of the Middle East.

On January 5, the President delivered in person a message to the Congress on this subject. On page 5 of that message, in paragraph V, the President said in part:

Under these circumstances, I deem it necessary to seek the cooperation of the Congress. Only with that cooperation can we give the reassurance needed to deter aggression, to give courage and confidence to those who are dedicated to freedom, and thus prevent a chain of events which would gravely endanger all of the free world.

Again the President said in the same paragraph:

Nonetheless, weaknesses in the present situation and increased dangers from international communism convinced me that basic United States policy should now find expression in joint action by the Congress and the Executive. Furthermore, our joint resolve should be so couched so as to make it apparent that if need be our words will be backed by action.

In the first sentence of paragraph VI, the President said:

It is nothing new for the President and the Congress to join to recognize that the national integrity of other free nations is directly related to our own security.

The message contemplates a joint determination by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, and the Congress of the United States, the constituted legislative body representing the people of the United States.

Upon the basis of this message, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee introduced Senate Joint Resolution 19. In the second section of the resolution the President "is authorized

to employ the Armed Forces of the United States if he deems it necessary to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of any such nation or group of nations requesting such aid against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by international communism," with provisos regarding our treaty obligations and the United Nations Charter.

Of course we will live up to our treaty obligations. Certainly there is no provision in the United Nations Charter that prevents us from taking such action as we believe necessary to promote our own security. When there is an aggression against another nation which may ultimately endanger our own security, we certainly can go to the assistance of that nation until the Security Council takes action, or after a failure of the Security Council to take action.

Our basic United States policy in this regard finds "expression in joint action by the Congress and the executives," to use the President's words. In short, the joint resolution tells the world that the executive and the legislative branches of our Government deem the situation sufficiently serious to our national security to lead them to be willing to go forward together and give the reassurances to the countries in the general area of the Middle East which they deem necessary to deter aggression by the forces of international communism.

The joint committee amended the original language of the joint resolution so that it now reads: "Furthermore, the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed force to assist any such nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed forces from any country controlled by international communism" together with generally similar provisos as in the original resolution.

I was among those committee members who were in favor of the joint resolution as originally written, because I believed that it clearly expressed the determination of the Congress to show the people and the governments of the countries concerned that we in the United States were determined to use our Armed Forces, if necessary to prevent armed aggression in any country in the general area of the Middle East.

I support the joint resolution in its amended form because I believe in substance it gives the same assurances, although not in such effective language. When we say that the United States regards as vital to the national interest and to world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East, we are speaking of the United States Government; we are speaking of the people of the United States.

The two branches of the Government concerned are the executive and legislative. They are the agencies of our National Government which have the responsibility of using our Armed Forces. The President is the Commander in

Chief. The Congress has the power to declare war, and the responsibility of providing the money with which to maintain the Armed Forces. I believe, therefore, that it will be clear to the governments and peoples of the countries concerned that the United States intends to help them to preserve their independence and integrity against armed aggression by forces of international communism. In addition, when the President, who is the Commander in Chief, determines that it is necessary to do so, the United States, through its Government, is prepared to use armed force.

When we pass a joint resolution in these terms and it is signed by the President, I feel convinced that any thinking, responsible leaders in the countries concerned will know and understand that the people of the United States, through their elected representatives, will support the President when he determines that it is necessary to use the Armed Forces of our country. This is the external impact of the joint resolution which is so needed.

Of equal importance in this basic purpose is the belief, which I share, that the joint resolution will act as a deterrent to Soviet Russia in whatever aggressive designs she may have in the Middle East. It must be apparent to the rulers of Russia that the adoption of the resolution, providing as it does for military defenses against aggressive acts, means that any aggression on her part will bring consequences which will be both immediate and devastating.

That is why I am convinced that this resolution will act as a strong deterrent to a clash of arms in the Middle East. Its purpose is to make the Soviets think twice before they commit directly or indirectly an aggressive act in the Middle East, in the full knowledge that such an act will mean the use of the Armed Forces of the United States. By the passage of the joint resolution, we believe that armed conflicts will be averted—not started.

When the danger of aggression by international communism has been deterred, it is my conviction that it will then be more possible to create a climate in which the basic problems between Israel and the Arab nations can be approached with a much better chance for their solution and for the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East.

The provision relative to the use of the Armed Forces of the United States is, in my opinion, the most fundamental of the three undertakings of the joint resolution. Altogether the resolution makes it crystal clear by stating the position of our country that we will take all steps necessary to prevent the outbreak of a war. This resolution is not a resolution to declare or to start an armed contest. It is to prevent the start of an armed contest. The President has said in his message and news conferences that if he does use our Armed Forces, he will so report at once to Congress for such action by them as is necessary; if the Congress is not in session, he will call it into session.

It is argued that the President has the authority to use the Armed Forces without action by Congress, if he deems

it necessary in the interests of our security. There is always a "gray area" as to the limits this authority includes. The argument is also made that Congress should not commit itself to a joint action with the President as Commander in Chief until it knows more clearly the action in which it is asked to participate. Again, I say the action in which we are now joining through the joint resolution is an expression of determination to prevent a war occurring, through deterring, by such expression, any nation from becoming an aggressor in this section of the world we consider vital to our own security.

The joint resolution seeks to strengthen our position by a clear expression of congressional views as to the position of the Congress if an armed aggression should take place.

Mr. President, it has been said that by passing this joint resolution, the Congress will abandon its constitutional obligation to determine whether the country should engage in war. It is also said that the joint resolution is superfluous because the President, under his executive powers, already has the authority and, indeed, the solemn obligation to use the Armed Forces when such action is essential to protect the vital interests of the Republic.

The argument that the joint resolution on the one hand goes too far, and on the other hand is unnecessary because of power already held by the President, seems to me to lack consistency.

Moreover, it is my opinion that the Congress is not relinquishing its responsibility to declare war by this declaration that we are ready to use our Armed Forces against aggression. The principles laid down in the joint resolution appear to me to be comparable to those of the Monroe Doctrine, in which this country expressed its intent to defend other nations in our hemisphere against aggressive acts, without specific mention of just how or when our Armed Forces would be employed. Furthermore, the President has pledged that he will keep Congress fully informed at all times.

The President does, of course, now have authority to use our Armed Forces. However, the joint resolution cannot be termed superfluous when it is considered in the light of its true purpose, namely, as an expression of the unified support of the executive and legislative branches of our Government on a vital question of foreign policy having an important bearing on the future peace of the world.

For these reasons, while I have preferred the language of Senate Joint Resolution 19 as originally written, because it seems to me clearer and simpler, I believe that the language adopted by the committee accomplishes the same result and makes clear the position of the United States Government, as expressed by its executive and legislative bodies. That is why I now support it.

The second purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President to undertake in the general area of the Middle East military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance.

The third purpose of the resolution is to authorize the President to "cooperate

with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence."

To carry out these purposes, the President is authorized to use for the remainder of the fiscal year 1957 not to exceed \$200 million from any appropriation now available for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. This measure releases him from certain restrictions imposed by that act, but makes it clear that only money in that act provided for military assistance can be used for military assistance under this joint resolution, and that only funds provided for economic assistance can be used for economic assistance under this joint resolution. Furthermore, he must report at least 15 days in advance of actual commitment to certain committees of the House and Senate, to show the object of the proposed use, the country for whom it is to be used, and the particular appropriation of the Mutual Security Act from which the funds are proposed to be derived.

No new appropriation is asked for. The \$200 million requested is to be taken from current fiscal year 1957 appropriations. If any further funds are to be had, there must be new authority and new appropriations in the fiscal year 1958.

There are several other qualifications for the use of these funds; but, broadly speaking, these are the significant ones. These provisions are included so as to give to nations which desire such assistance a greater degree of confidence, that we are their friends and that they may have confidence in our support and help to help themselves. In short, the overall effect of this section is mainly psychological.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read 3 paragraphs of the testimony given by Admiral Radford and 2 paragraphs of the testimony given by Secretary of State Dulles. I believe these five paragraphs summarize more succinctly than any other testimony we received at the committee hearings the purposes of the joint resolution.

Admiral Radford testified:

I did say yesterday that in my opinion if this resolution is passed and it is thus made perfectly evident that we are going to back up countries who might be attacked by a Communist-controlled country, the Russians will be inclined to review their programs, and so will the countries they are supplying with arms.

In other words, the countries supplied by Russia would receive advance notice from the terms of this resolution that if they become controlled by international communism and attack free nations in the area, we will, on request, come to the aid of the free nations.

Again he said:

If we adopt the policies that are permitted by this resolution, it is my feeling that the United States' efforts will stabilize the governments that are now determined to remain free from Communist control, and I think we can reasonably hope that some of the Arab countries which have not yet openly taken a stand against the activities of inter-

national communism will be encouraged to do so.

That was the testimony of Admiral Radford in explanation of what the joint resolution would do.

Secretary Dulles added from the witness stand, when I read those paragraphs to him:

I would like, as long as you allowed me two sentences, to say that I have previously testified, I think, that the passage of this resolution will deprive the Soviet Communists of much of their incentive to build up satellites in the area to be used, possibly, to attack other countries, because if they know that having made Egypt or Syria, for example, into a satellite, that if it then should attack Israel or Iraq, then upon the request of the victim attacked we would come into the fray, obviously under those circumstances the satellite would be wiped out.

Therefore, this cuts down very greatly the potential value of satellites in the area; and, since that is the case, I think they will spend less effort to create satellites, just as the Caracas resolution cut down the value to international communism of getting control of the political institutions of an American State. We said if that happens we are all going to go in to deal with that situation. Ever since then, there has been less effort to get control, and I think the same would be the case here.

That was the testimony of Secretary of State Dulles and of Admiral Radford. Those five paragraphs seem to me to summarize all the testimony we heard regarding the value of the joint resolution and the purpose for which our action on it is requested.

It is argued that there has not been sufficient testimony of a specific character to justify having the Congress make it possible for our Government to make available \$200 million worth of military and economic assistance to these countries, and that we should know more as to the purposes of the Executive. On the other hand, if more detailed testimony were to be given as to amounts, type of equipment, or economic aid to go to a particularly country, that would immediately create problems with other countries. So it is obvious that greater difficulties are involved in administering an economic aid and military assistance program efficiently and helpfully for the purpose of this joint resolution, which is to achieve greater security for our own country by the turning of the faces of the countries in the general area of the Middle East to the West, rather than to the East, and by giving them confidence in our friendship.

So much for my understanding of the purposes of the joint resolution.

Today the United States is the leader of the free nations of the world. There are constantly devolving upon us new responsibilities to which we must dedicate our abilities and our efforts. All of us who are connected with the Government want to see the United States undertake the responsibilities which we believe will offer greater opportunities for our own security and better chances for a more peaceful world. The situation in the Middle East has become consistently more difficult since World War II. Its importance to our economy and the economy of Europe has become materially greater. The growing importance of oil as a fuel has increased the

economic stature of the countries having oil reserves. This has resulted in a heavily increased traffic through the Suez Canal.

Another event of great significance in this area is the establishment of Israel as a free and independent nation. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have stated clearly that Israel must be preserved as a free nation. We want Israel to be our friend. Her real enemies, as I have said before, are not, in the long run, the nations around her, but are Russia and the Soviets, if they come into the Middle East.

These two fundamentals have made the problems of the area more acute. As a result of the acuteness, we have seen the development of the Baghdad Pact, the Tripartite Agreement, and the Organization of the Arab States. Colonel Nasser, the leader of Egypt, has taken arms from Czechoslovakia. Then he seized the canal. The final straw came when Israel, France, and Britain attacked Egypt, and our differences with those countries arose because we refused to join with them as an aggressor against Egypt. As a result of all these developments, we find a constantly increasing effort, through material aid and propaganda by the Soviets, to seek to increase their influence in the Middle East; and it is evident they have made some progress in some nations by their propaganda and by furnishing of arms.

What we and other free nations want is an opportunity to work out with patience, through the medium of diplomacy, the various problems which have arisen. We realize that we must recognize the national aspirations of these countries. We know we have to consider their individual situations. We also recognize the importance to our security and to the economic affairs of the world of the Suez Canal being operated as an international waterway, while recognizing the territorial status of the canal in Egypt. The need to open the Gulf of Aqaba becomes clearer each day. We need time to work out these problems in such a way that as to make certain that Russia will not take over the Middle East, with an irreparable loss to our own commerce and the destruction of the European economy. If Russia should do so, it would almost make certain a new world war. We hope that the people of these nations who want to be free, who are proud of their nationality, and who naturally have economic, patriotic, and independent aspirations, will turn toward the West to get their ambitions fulfilled.

In the pending joint resolution we state firmly that we in the United States, if the President determines it necessary, are prepared to use our Armed Forces. Furthermore, we offer to help these nations with military assistance and with economic support. The President needs the support of Congress to show that we as a Nation are determined to prevent aggression from taking place; and by expressing clearly that intention, we are hopeful that aggression will not take place. If the President does have to use our Armed Forces, he will come promptly to Congress.

Let us keep these fundamental facts clearly before us. This resolution is a resolution to prevent war and not to take aggressive steps. This resolution makes it clear that the Congress, the legislative representatives of the people of the United States, supports the Chief Executive in taking the necessary steps which we pray will prevent war.

I hope the resolution will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who made a splendid presentation of the issue which confronts the Senate and of the substance of the joint resolution. I also wish to commend the Senator from Rhode Island for the very effective way in which he conducted the hearings held jointly by the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. In addition I want to express my congratulations to my colleague, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who is the ranking Republican of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Massachusetts was speaking from the standpoint of the Armed Services Committee, and, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I desire to congratulate him for his fine contribution to the subject.

In presenting the matter this afternoon, those of us who have spoken or who are about to speak are trying to give a comprehensive picture, from the viewpoints of both sides of the aisle and of both committees, of the purpose of the resolution, and I shall address myself to that subject.

I have entitled the first part of my remarks "Bipartisanship in American Foreign Policy." We are witnessing a fine example of bipartisanship in the way the resolution is being presented, because, while different views will be presented, they will be uttered in a spirit of bipartisanship, and will reflect the determination of a united America on the critical matter of foreign policy.

I. BIPARTISANSHIP IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

The Eisenhower Middle East doctrine has been the subject of intense and searching debate in these Halls since the opening of the present session of Congress. A question of such importance to the security of this Nation and to the peace of the world, merits thoughtful inquiry and discussion.

The great events which, less than two decades ago, propelled this Nation to assume a significant and responsible role at the forefront of world affairs also promoted the development of a complementary attitude here in America—national realization that politics must stop at the water's edge. The concept of bipartisanship in foreign affairs affirms the great responsibility shared by the Congress and the President in promulgating an enlightened American policy to guide our relations with other nations and other peoples.

Bipartisanship is the uniting factor in an all-American foreign policy directed at deterring war and effectuating peace. Its essence is responsible cooperation and its process is mature, legitimate de-

bate from all members of our two great political parties, to the end that policy may be constructively formulated in the best interests of this Nation. Responsible cooperation does not abjure, but rather welcomes, legitimate criticism and constructive alternatives stemming from differences in policy positions and appraisals.

It was with deep interest and attention that I listened several days ago to the able address by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] on United States foreign policy, an address which reflected the essence of bipartisanship.

I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] in his conception of the sound bipartisan approach. In the address referred to, he used this language:

The functions of foreign policy are shared functions, shared between the legislative and executive branches of the Government. They can be effectively discharged only when there is leadership in the Presidency and when there is a mutual will to cooperate between the executive branch and Congress.

II. RESPONSIBLE COOPERATION

It was gratifying that the Senator from Montana reaffirmed his belief in responsible cooperation by all parties in Congress and by all organs entrusted with participation in the formulation of United States foreign policy. With this approach I am in complete agreement.

In the interests of constructive debate, however, I believe there are several points in the Senator's address which call for further discussion and perhaps reappraisal. I respectfully differ from the Senator's implications that the recent election campaign concealed "festerings" Middle East problems until a point of crisis was reached, and that the handling of the Middle East resolution by the President and the Secretary of State constituted "blatant press agency." I have put quotation marks around certain words to indicate they are quoted from the remarks of the Senator from Montana.

What actually is the urgency which necessitates immediate adoption of this resolution? It must be remembered that, as the President stated in his message to Congress, the Eisenhower doctrine is not intended to supply answers to all the many problems with which the Middle East is beset. We all acknowledge, as pointed out by the learned Senator in his address, the existence of such highly disruptive factors as Arab-Israeli tension, the intense nationalism and poverty of the Middle East peoples, and the crisis precipitated by the seizure of the Suez Canal. I shall refer to these problems later on in my remarks, but the point I wish to make now is that the reason for the urgent request by the President for the passage of this resolution centers primarily upon the danger which burst upon the Middle East early last November—the peril of imminent Communist expansion into that area. The resolution is designed to secure immediate assistance to the Middle East nations in an effort to bolster their ability to resist communism at this critical moment—a moment when they have become weakened by the withdrawal of

British and French influence and have suffered losses of revenue as a result of the closing of the Suez Canal and the destruction of pipelines.

Russian and Chinese threats last fall to send "volunteers" into the area, subsequent to the British-French entrance into the Middle East hostilities, constituted a thinly veiled pretense to disguise actual aggression. The continued existence of this threat is a powerful factor in promoting instability and weakness in the Middle East.

The Eisenhower doctrine was promulgated to offset the imminent peril of Communist expansion in the Middle East and to counteract the dangerous consequences of the increasing weakness of the Middle East nations resulting from last fall's fighting. These very recent, explosive facts have certainly not been concealed, and they have no relation whatever to the recent election campaign.

The criticism of the Senator from Montana fails to differentiate between the recent and imminent Communist threat and the other long-term problems in the Middle East—problems on which the President and the Department of State have been working continually in cooperation with other nations, and in the United Nations. I have had the great privilege and honor of participating in many such conferences.

Nor do I believe that the handling of the resolution by the executive branch had all the "earmarks of blatant press agency," calculated to press Congress into submission to the executive. Consultation between members of Congress and the executive occurred prior to the President's address to the Congress on January 5. The address was delivered after a determination by the Chief Executive that there existed in the Middle East an emergency situation which demanded the application and reaffirmation by the Congress and the President of basic policies which have been adopted in other areas where Communist danger became imminent. Of the criticisms which have been directed at the resolution since that date, few have denied the validity of the need for a warning to Russia, or the necessity for a stabilizing agency in the Middle East.

Hints of a request by Egypt for volunteers if the Israeli Army fails to evacuate the Gaza Strip and the approaches to the Gulf of Aqaba and, by Yemen in its conflict with Aden, are cogent reminders of the continued existence of this critical situation. The intensive explorations by members of the two committees into all these events fully support the request for urgency by the President.

III. THE DANGERS OF IRRESPONSIBILITY

These are differences of appraisal and approach, differences which are not inconsistent with the flowering of bipartisanship and of responsible cooperation.

Responsible cooperation assumes moderation and deliberation. It deplores the use of excessive exaggeration and of practices which seek to advance partisan political aims under the guise of constructive debate.

However, responsible cooperation ceases to be either responsible or cooperation, and may even become highly dangerous when it fails to perform its constructive function and deviates instead into paths of partisan political blocking of American foreign policy. Obstructionism and irresponsible division are effective only in destroying the impact abroad of an all-American foreign policy and in befuddling and obscuring the issues for the people here at home.

Let us consider the probable consequences of rejection of the President's proposal. There would be a continued invitation to the Soviet Union to expand into the Middle East, or if not to expand, to intensify its drive to keep the area in ferment.

Undiminished unrest in the Middle East would mean continued tension between the Afro-Asian nations and the West, between the Arab States and the free Western nations, and between the Arab States and Israel. A source of friction between Russia and the West would continue to fester and the pressures on peace-sustaining agencies would become increasingly more heavy. The Middle East nations would not be able to benefit from the vast petroleum potential which they possess and neither would the rest of the world. In all probability there would be a rapid worsening of the explosive, tragic, status quo and, above all, an irreparable loss to the free nations of the world.

Destructive and irresponsible assaults upon the Middle East doctrine place an enormous responsibility upon those who make such assaults.

I regret to say that in addition to the carefully considered criticisms of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and other thoughtful presentations in this forum, we have recently heard the use of such indefensible and irresponsible phraseology as "naked executive power will rule the highest and most fateful interests of the Nation"; "power blindly put into his hands by the Congress"; "when we take away from Congress its constitutional powers and substitute Executive power, we start down the road of the police state"; and "this administration does not wish to move until it hog-ties every Member of Congress." Also the irresponsible reflections on the integrity of the Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles, are certainly indefensible in a debate of this character.

Such attacks as those mentioned, in my opinion, do not help to clarify the debate; instead, they tend only to confuse and confuse. They ignore the traditions of American history and of the American people; they ignore our heritage of constitutional self-restraint; and they insult the American people and their elected representatives. I do not believe that they represent constructive, responsible cooperation.

I do believe that it is time to clear the air of these will-o'-the-wisps of conjecture and to examine, dispassionately and reasonably, both the doctrine and the criticisms directed at it, in order to ascertain what is being asked for and why.

IV. THE EISENHOWER RESOLUTION AS RELATED TO AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

To the Senator from Montana the Eisenhower resolution represents not isolationism, not internationalism, but isolated internationalism. I believe, however, that an examination of the facts will show that such a characterization is actually misleading and is a misnomer for a resolution which is completely in accord with the objectives of American foreign policy.

The resolution which is under debate has three features: (a) The President is authorized to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East desiring such assistance in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence; (b) the President is authorized to undertake, in the general area of the Middle East, military assistance programs with any nation or group of nations of that area desiring such assistance; and (c) a declaration that the United States regards as vital to the national interest and world peace, the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East, and that if the President determines the necessity thereof—which is the amendment which has been discussed by previous speakers—the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism; provided, that such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

Actually the resolution is a reaffirmation of the United States foreign aid policy to extend assistance to other nations to help them become free and strong, as enunciated in the Mutual Security Act of 1954 and prior acts, as well as in pending legislation. It does remove, because of emergency conditions, certain restrictions on the expenditure of some two hundred million dollars appropriated for the Middle East for fiscal 1957. In this respect it follows a pattern of the waiver of other requirements of the mutual-security program which Congress authorized in 1954 because of an emergency in certain Southeast Asian states.

It supplements our support, financial and diplomatic, of the United Nations in its efforts to attain solutions to the problems of the Suez Canal, Arab-Israeli tension, and relocation of the refugees, problems which that body, with its machinery for negotiation and moral persuasion, is far more suited to handle than is the United States alone.

It is in accord with our determination, as expressed in the Truman doctrine of 1947, and the Vandenberg resolution of 1948, to resist Communist expansion, and to exercise the right of individual or collective self-defense under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter should any armed attack occur affecting our national security.

Finally, it reflects our policy of united action by the President and the Congress—or the Senate—in recognizing that the national integrity of other free

nations is directly related to our own security, a policy which we demonstrated in adopting the North Atlantic Treaty, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the Formosa Resolution, and several other multilateral and bilateral defense agreements.

V. THE EISENHOWER DOCTRINE—AN ANALYSIS

Mr. President, now let me turn to the Eisenhower doctrine and to an analysis of it. The subject has already been covered by other speakers, but, for the record, I shall discuss it again.

The Eisenhower doctrine from which the resolution emanates does not attempt to cover all the complex problems of the Middle East, many of which are being handled by the United Nations. Its purpose is to shore up the Middle East against Communist penetration at this critical period, and it contains no explicit solutions to the other acknowledged problems of that area. What it seems to accomplish is the creation of an atmosphere of stability under which policies to solve these problems peacefully can be developed. It does not constitute a detailed policy; rather, it is a doctrine, an "umbrella" to protect against disruptive Communist expansion. It provides the essential cover necessary before other measures can successfully be undertaken. It is, to use a slang phrase, the erection of a "no fishing" sign in response to Russian angling in the troubled waters of the Middle East.

We must not distract our attention from the immediate, urgent crisis to in committee centered on this subject, consider other problems and measures now. A considerable amount of debate and the discussion revolved around the issue of whether we should include a long list of local problems of the Middle East in this resolution. The pending resolution is not intended to cover those problems.

Because of the existing distribution of power in the world today, only the United States can issue the strong warning which can deter Russia and simultaneously provide a bolster for the Middle East nations. Our prestige in this respect has been enhanced by our stand in the United Nations in November when we insisted upon cessation of the Suez hostilities.

The doctrine primarily seeks to accomplish the following:

First. To protect the territorial integrity and independence of the Middle East nations by deterring the possibility of attacks upon them from countries controlled by international communism, and it thus attempts to effect for the area a degree of stability essential to the solution of its problems by peaceful means.

Second. To bolster the Middle East nations psychologically at this critical period in order that they may resist communism more effectively.

Third. To assist them, in this emergency and later, in opposing Communist subversion by strengthening them economically and providing them with the means of achieving internal stability.

Fourth. To reaffirm United States policy that we do not intend to intervene

in the affairs of any foreign nation or violate its sovereignty; that we will assist any such nation only by agreement and consent.

I wish to emphasize that point: We are to assist only by agreement and with the consent of the nation concerned.

Fifth. To reaffirm our interest in the development of the Middle East nations toward freedom, independence, and self-determination as member nations in the world, by promoting their economic growth and stability and thus lessening their weakness to external economic pressure.

Sixth. To prevent a third world war and to promote needed peace in the area which will permit its great petroleum and other economic potentials to be used for the benefit of the nations in that area and in other parts of the world.

Many of the objections to the Eisenhower doctrine are not truly valid, because they relate to problems which are extraneous to the immediate emergency which is the concern of the President's proposal, and to problems which are being handled through other means.

Certain objections do pertain to the resolution itself. Prime among them are the charges that economic aid should not be included in a resolution directed at deterring war, and that adoption of the resolution will carry certain undesirable constitutional implications.

The first objection strikes at the heart of the doctrine, and at a fundamental premise of American foreign policy, namely, the objective of enabling other nations to become self-sufficient, independent, and strong enough to resist communism; or, in other words, to help other nations to help themselves.

The second objection, namely, that the resolution is creating a dangerous constitutional precedent, appears to be disposed of by the final form of the language in section 2, which avoids the direct constitutional issue. The resolution as finally reported does not involve the yielding of senatorial authority or prestige, nor does it affect the constitutional power of the President.

Its form as a joint resolution is intended to indicate the solidarity of the Congress and the President in a determination to resist Communist aggression.

It is not intended to authorize the President to declare war, nor is it a delegation of congressional authority in this respect. It is a statement of United States intent directed at achieving the maximum psychological and political impact abroad. I do not believe that its adoption with this interpretation will create an untenable constitutional precedent.

In his address of January 5, the President stated:

If, contrary to my hope and expectation, a situation arose which called for the military application of the policy which I ask Congress to join me in proclaiming, I would, of course, maintain hour-by-hour contact with the Congress if it were in session. And if the Congress were not in session, and if the situation had grave implications, I would, of course, at once call the Congress into special session.

While the President's statement has not been expressly incorporated into the

resolution, the latter can be interpreted, in my opinion, as though the statement were a part of it. He has stated explicitly that he will immediately work in cooperation with the Congress in effecting a program of resistance to an aggressor, but that he alone may have to take steps of initial resistance.

This appears to be a complete adherence to the constitutional principle of legislative-executive cooperation in foreign affairs and in the protection of the security of the United States.

VI. CONCLUSION

Mr. President, in this brief statement supporting the resolution as it is reported by the committee, I have endeavored to point out the reasons for urgency: the military, economic, and subversive aspects of the situation in the Middle East; the need to fill the vacuum of legitimate power brought about by the withdrawal of the British and the French from the area; the carrying out by the President's proposals of the basic principles and practices of the United States, especially since the time of the declaration of the so-called Truman policy in Greece and Turkey. Furthermore, I have endeavored to show why the resolution does not and is not intended to meet the various critical problems within the area. As has been well stated, it acts as an "umbrella" or a shield to protect the area from Communist infiltration, either military or economic. Finally, it aims by joint action by the President and Congress to declare the basic purposes of the doctrine.

One final word. In times of great crises in our history we have been protected by what seems to be a divine hand watching over our destiny. At critical moments we have been given great leaders who had the vision to see the full significance of those forces that guided our ancestors to come to this land in order that they might worship God in their own way, and might discover the road to the true freedom of the individual human being. The names of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln stand out in our history, as well as the names of many others who seem to have been guided to help us in times of great distress.

Now, in this period of world turmoil, we have been given a leader who, by the integrity of his life and his great experience is equipped to point the way to our national security and to ultimate world peace. The greatest military leader of this generation, certainly one of the greatest in our history, is now dedicated, as our President, to peace in the world.

The need for full and unconditional support by the Congress of President Eisenhower at this critical period rises above all thought of partisanship, or differences over mere phraseology. Such support is really a dedication by us all that the United States, conceived in liberty, may help to guide a stricken world to freedom and lasting peace.

It is my sincere hope that the joint resolution will be passed by the Senate by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from New Jersey for what he has said. It seems to me it supplements and amplifies what the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GREEN] has said and what I have tried to say. The three statements fit very well together.

Perhaps this is an oversimplification, but as I visualize the purpose of the resolution, it is to have the Congress and the Executive, like two people, walk along the street together and force a way or clear a path; and to demonstrate that it is stronger to go forward together than it is for one person to walk behind and push the other. Is that, in a very simple way, what the Senator's idea is of the resolution?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator. I think we indicate in the resolution the constitutional powers of the President and of the Congress, and our recognition that they complement each other. Neither one precedes the other, as the Senator has so ably suggested.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator has said, we hang a "No Fishing" sign out over the area to enable us to move forward by diplomatic action toward peace and to be forceful in our efforts if peace is not maintained.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his very lucid remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment and to commend the senior Senator from New Jersey for the address he has just made to the Senate. He has spoken, and spoken well, for the administration's point of view insofar as the Eisenhower resolution, the business now before the Senate, is concerned. There are differences of opinion, as the Senator has so very well brought out, between what the administration thinks should be done to take care of a very delicate and difficult situation in the Middle East, and those of us who feel that there are certain alternatives which might be offered.

The charge has been made that the Democrats at times have a great deal of hindsight but never come up with anything constructive. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me that that has not been the attitude of the Democratic Party. While we have criticized, we have not criticized merely for the sake of criticism alone. The Senator from New Jersey will recall that many Senators on this side of the aisle, in finding fault with the proposals sent to the Congress by the administration, have, at the same time, tried to offer something constructive.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I know that has been the attitude of the Senator from Montana, and I am certain that other Senators have also been sincere in their actions.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We recognize the difficulties which exist in the field of foreign policy. We know full well the great responsibilities which lie upon the shoulders of the President of the United States, who is charged with the conduct of foreign policy under the Constitution. We are well aware of the tremendous burdens which the able, hard-working Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, has to assume in this difficult and dangerous period in which we live. However, some of us do not feel that this resolution goes to the heart of the difficulties in the Middle East. We feel it would be better to face up to such things as the Arab-Israel dispute, the question of the Suez Canal, the question of Soviet traffic in arms in that area, the question of refugees, the question of subversion, as well as others. Simply because the administration has sent to the Congress a resolution, I do not think we should be placed in the position of having to accept it, as the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee said, to the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator, but we must also be alert to condemn tactics of obstructionism.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the able Senator will allow me to continue my discussion of the matter with the Senator from New Jersey, and I should like to conclude.

We wish to cooperate. We think we can offer ideas which may have value. We should like to have those ideas considered, because I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, a man of great intellectual ability, by the way, that we are in accord with the old Vandenberg statement that politics should stop at the water's edge. But we do not think we should have merely something that puts an umbrella over the situation. That is not the answer. The umbrella is there now. We want to make absolutely certain in this thermodynamic age that the President of the United States has the right at all times to act instantly, if he deems it necessary, in the defense of our country.

I was delighted to hear the Senator refer to the amendment added to the resolution by the joint committee. It was proposed and accepted so that the responsibility should be in the hands of the President of the United States prior to a declaration of war.

What the joint committee has done, in effect, has been to reaffirm and to reassert the constitutional power of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. It is my hope that we as Senators will recognize our individual responsibility in that respect, and that the Senate as a body will likewise remember that what we do today or what we may not do may have repercussions decades and centuries hence.

I only wanted to make those few remarks, Mr. President. I desire to again commend the Senator from New Jersey for making a statesmanlike address and to congratulate him on the way he has presented the matter to the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the junior Senator from Montana on the very clear, forthright, able, and patriotic statement he has just made, and to state that I fully subscribe to the views he has expressed not only with reference to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, but about the intent of the majority party in the United States Senate.

When I first became minority leader I said to my conference that I rejected the philosophy that it was the duty of the opposition to oppose, that when I believed the President of the United States, who happened to be a member of another party, to be right, I would hold his hand high and support him. I am proud of the record I have made in that respect. I said that when I believed him to be wrong I would attempt to debate, discuss, and point out the errors as I saw them, and undertake to improve proposed legislation without regard to personalities. That I have tried to do.

The President asked the House and the Senate, a coordinate independent branch of this Government, for cooperation; he sought cooperation; he came here pleading for cooperation; and I will say, Mr. President, he received cooperation. Cooperation does not mean a one-way street. Cooperation does not mean a dead-end street. Cooperation means a contribution of ideas and the improvement of language and actual rephrasing of whole paragraphs. As the majority leader and as the leader of the so-called opposition party I take great pride in the fact that the joint committee inserted a cutoff date in the resolution. We have required reports to be submitted on allocations before finalization. Those reports will come to the Congress. So it can never be charged that we did not know where they came from or who was making them.

Finally, Mr. President, I am glad we said to the President, "If you decide in your constitutional capacity that this is in the best interest of our country, we will stand by your side and support you."

Other peoples of the world may not understand our constitutional system; they may not realize that we have been quibbling over legalistic points in some instances, but the one thing they must not misunderstand is the unity which must exist among the people of this great Republic.

There is no place for politics in foreign policy.

I congratulate the Senator from Montana for what he has said and for what he has done, and I also congratulate the other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle who have made substantial contributions.

One thing which Russia must not doubt is the unity of the American people in an hour of trial.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Texas. I think this

exchange of views has told Russia where a united America stands.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I wish, first, to commend and thank my senior colleague from New Jersey for the comprehensive and penetrating statement he has made, and for his clear delineation of what the joint resolution is intended to do and what it is not intended to do. I commend him also for his exposition of the great need for action upon it.

At the same time, I express my personal appreciation, as my senior colleague has done, to the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Montana for the spirit in which they have engaged in the discussion this afternoon and for the manner in which they have approached the subject.

As my senior colleague has pointed out, the colloquy which has just been had will make it clearer than ever that there is no disunity in this country, so far as the support of the President is concerned in this delicate and difficult situation, and also that America is behind him and is united for action—I believe and hope the passage of the resolution will make action unnecessary—in the event the circumstances contemplated by the resolution should come into existence.

I wish expressly to say this word in regard to the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I was very much pleased to hear him state that he wanted no doubt to exist, as I understood him to say, as to his view that the President had the right to act in an emergency as the commander in chief of the Armed Forces of the United States. I say this particularly because I had seen in the press some comment attributed to the Senator from Montana which raised a little doubt in my mind about his view in this crucial matter. I am glad to know from the colloquy today that there can no longer be any doubt.

I conclude by again commending my senior colleague and thanking him for his excellent statement.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my colleague.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the commendation of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who have so very ably stated what the United States is endeavoring to do by the consideration and the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 19. The Senator from New Jersey has very clearly stated what we are endeavoring to do. We, as a nation, through the Executive and Congress, stand shoulder to shoulder in our determination to maintain peace throughout the world.

Nothing could be more encouraging to the smaller nations of the Middle East than to know that the great legislative body representing the people of the

the United States stands with the illustrious and great leader, President Eisenhower, in our efforts as a people to maintain peace throughout the world, and to let the small, indefensible nations—indefensible as to Russia—have the security and the knowledge that we, the United States, are determined by the action which is expressed in joint resolution to give them, first, security, if there is an invading army; and second, that we have proposed economic aid which will give to them, and especially their youth, the understanding and the confidence that in the tomorrow they will have a better economy; that by our assistance they will have better security than their parents ever had in their endeavors to rear their children.

By the joint resolution America is saying to the rest of the world that we will not tolerate Soviet encroachment upon the indefensible, small nations. We are saying that we want peace, and that we are determined that we shall stand as a nation united in our endeavor to maintain and bring peace to the world.

No action could be more forceful than our unified support of the joint resolution. Nothing could speak more loudly than the passage of the resolution by a unanimous vote.

I commend the Democratic Members of the Senate for the splendid cooperation they have given in the joint committee sessions by affording all persons who desired to be heard the right to be heard, and then discussing and debating the measure, but in the main in coming forward in support of the joint resolution.

In this way we are signaling to Russia what our intentions are. We are at work today in the Middle East trying to clear away the difficulties which exist between the Arabs and the Israelis. We will continue to work in that field, and I am confident that a way will be found by which to solve the difficulties.

But in the main we are showing the world today that we do not intend to allow the small, indefensible nations to become victims of the continuing encroachment of the Soviet Union in its endeavor to spread the philosophy of Communist ideology through the world.

Again I express my commendation of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for their excellent statements.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in view of the approaching meeting at 8:30 tomorrow morning of the President with the leadership of both Houses of Congress on the Middle Eastern situation, I called today a meeting of the majority policy committee of the United States Senate. I requested the members of the Democratic policy committee to give me guidance. I set forth my own views by reading them a letter which I addressed to the distinguished Secretary of State on February 11, 1957.

Subsequently, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the secretary of the majority conference, moved that the entire majority policy committee go on

record as endorsing the letter. The motion was seconded by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Democratic whip, and was adopted unanimously, with all Democratic members present.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may include the letter in the RECORD. It is a little long, so I will not ask my friend, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, to indulge me while I read it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield the floor, unless other Senators wish to ask me questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator. If I may, then, I will read the letter. It is dated February 11, 1957, and is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1957.
The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I feel that I should tell you, most frankly, how disturbed I have been by recent stories in the press, which stories have appeared under the bylines of most reputable correspondents, that serious consideration is being given in the General Assembly of the United Nations to imposing economic sanctions against the State of Israel. The purpose of these sanctions would, of course, be to force Israel to withdraw its forces from the Gaza Strip and the mouth of the Aqaba Gulf. This imposition of sanctions would, or so it appears to me, be a most unwise move. It seems to me that this is so irrespective of whatever point of view one may take toward the various resolutions of the Assembly which have called for such withdrawals.

To put it simply, the United Nations cannot apply one rule for the strong and another for the weak; it cannot organize its economic weight against the little state when it has not previously made even a pretense of doing so against the large states. I have, Mr. Secretary, seen no suggestions in the United Nations of the application of economic sanctions against the U. S. S. R. Israel has in very large part complied with the directives of the United Nations. Russia has not even pretended to be polite.

I have, as you know, been urging during the discussion of the Middle East a determined effort by the United Nations and by the United States to go to the root causes of the troubles in the Middle East. One of these causes has been the hostile activity against Israel on the part of Egypt from the Gaza Strip and the threat of activity in the Gulf of Aqaba. I think you will agree that it is not utterly unreasonable for Israel to request guaranties by the United Nations that these attacks against her will not once more be prevalent, once she has withdrawn her troops from these two areas. Yet, I have seen no suggestion in the United Nations that economic sanctions should be applied against Egypt to force that state to agree to permanent cessation of hostile activities from those areas.

There is always a tendency to oversimplify a most complicated issue when one writes such a letter as this and it is my hope that you will not think that this protest is made without some awareness of the complexities. These, however, cannot be stated in the space of this letter nor should they be.

But the merits, the justice and the morality in this situation are clear against such imposition of economic sanction. It is my hope that you will instruct the American delegation to the United Nations to oppose with all its skill such a proposal if it is formally made.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

I wrote that letter in my individual capacity and upon my authority and responsibility as a Member of the United States Senate from the State of Texas. I thought that my associates on the majority policy committee, created by statute of the Congress, should have the benefit of my views; therefore, I have read the letter.

Subsequently, unanimous action endorsing the letter was taken. At this time I have read the letter into the RECORD for the information of all Senators.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHURCH in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The issue the distinguished majority leader has just discussed has always been bipartisan, both in the other body and in this one. I compliment the majority leader upon his sensitivity to the situation, in making the presentation here also a bipartisan one. The minority leader also has spoken to the same effect.

Just as sanctions would hardly be a contribution to a joint resolution designed to meet a difficult situation, but would only be likely to make it worse and aggravate it more, does not the Senator from Texas also feel that the very evident action to be taken by this body on the pending joint resolution will go far toward clearing the air, in the sense that if we are dealing with the Middle East as the Middle East, without Russian puppets operating in it, there is much more chance to have the United States and the rest of the free world obtain some results, rather than if we were dealing with small states in the Middle East when being manipulated by the Communists for their own purposes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think that is true, and I hope that will be the result. I hope that the results which will come from the joint resolution will exceed our greatest hopes.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the benefit of the Senators now present, the Chair wishes to make a brief explanation and statement.

The Senate now has under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 19, dealing with the Middle East situation. The joint resolution has been reported with a committee amendment, which strikes out all after the enacting clause and inserts a complete substitute.

In such cases, under the precedents of the Senate, the substitute is considered as original text for the purpose of amendment, and is subject to amendment in two degrees. An amendment to the original text would have precedence over an amendment to the substitute. Amendments to the original text or to the committee substitute will have precedence over a vote on the substitute itself.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement made a few moments ago by the majority leader, the distinguished

senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. In referring to it, I wish to make it clear that I speak for no one but myself.

Today I have heard three very able speeches directed to the pending measure, the Middle East joint resolution. Implicit and announced in those speeches was the necessity for bipartisan or nonpartisan action.

Today, I have read that the President of the United States is returning to Washington to consider a very critical question: that is the impasse which has arisen regarding the actions which may be taken by Israel with respect to the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I also understand that on tomorrow there is to be a meeting between the leaders of the majority and the minority, and the President of the United States, to consider the policy of the administration, respecting this question.

I suggest that the consideration of this issue presents an opportunity for a practical application of the policy of bipartisanship or nonpartisanship. In the debate that has commenced today, we are discussing a joint resolution, and the application of bipartisanship to words and to future action. But, before the President of the United States is a situation which calls for present decision in the United Nations. The capacity of the United States to apply effectually the Middle East joint resolution may depend upon what happens in the General Assembly of the United Nations with respect to the response of Israel to the resolution of the United Nations.

Mr. President, the position of the United States is a difficult one. We sympathize with the position of Israel, with the difficulties she has faced because the Arab nations have not recognized her status as a state, the denial of passage through the Suez Canal and to the Gulf of Aqaba, and the attacks against her in the past. I believe we want also to maintain the principle of opposition to force that we have asserted in the United Nations.

I hope the leadership of both parties will not take such inflexible positions as will make the task of the President of the United States more difficult. Before the Mid-East resolution will have a chance to begin to operate, there must be some kind of a peace in the area. The uncertainty, and danger of new outbreaks will continue until a decision is made by Israel as to whether or not it will withdraw its troops. I am certain all of us want to see for Israel progress toward freedom of access to the Gulf of Aqaba. I think the legal situation with respect to the Gaza Strip is more unclear. However, I believe the capacity to achieve these results, to remove the danger of a new outbreak of hostilities, to reach solutions, to maintain the principle of opposing force, depends in large measure in preserving to the President flexibility in working out this difficult situation. For the Congress of the United States or its leadership, or the majority or minority to proclaim positions which will make it more difficult for the President—to move toward the ends we all want, and harden Israel or

Egypt in their positions, will not help assure our objectives. As worth while and laudable as may be the general principle which the distinguished majority leader has announced, I think it would be better if such a fixed position were not proclaimed at this time, and full opportunity were given the President and the Secretary of State to work out a peaceful and just solution of the impasse in the United Nations, in accordance with the principles we have taken in that body. If war should break out again, the chances of success of the Mid-East doctrine we are discussing would be dim, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am today submitting an amendment to the pending Middle East resolution which, if adopted, would require any nation receiving assistance under that resolution to give a binding commitment against aggression against its neighbors and to negotiate matters in controversy with neighboring States, and, failing such agreement, to submit such matters to arbitration.

I think it is generally recognized that the principal danger in the Middle East is not overt aggression by the Soviet Union. We are all opposed to that, but that is not the principal danger. There is a danger of Soviet subversion against which the Middle East resolution does not move. The real danger of hostilities is, rather, that one or more of the Middle East nations, a number of which have declared their belligerent intentions, and several which may be armed with Soviet weapons and, instigated by Soviet guile, may commit aggressions against other Middle East nations—to be specific, that Syria may attack Iraq; that Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria may attack Israel.

The real need, therefore, goes beyond the assurance of American military support to assist the defense of any country against Communist aggression and to provide unspecified economic and military assistance. It is essential, if it is possible to do so, to try to secure binding agreements from these nations that they will not launch any such attacks, that they will negotiate the disputes which now divide them from their neighbors in a good-faith effort to make a stable peace, and if they are unable to adjust these disputes by negotiation, that they will submit such matters to arbitration. It should likewise be clear that any military assistance afforded under the pending resolution, by agreement, will be limited to use for self-defense.

If such commitments can be obtained and faithfully adhered to, they will thus stop the launching of the most probable breaches of the peace in that area. To supplement the threat of American retaliation against Communist aggression with the promise of recipient nations not to commit aggression against their neighbors would seem to be a desirable strengthening of the present resolution.

I favor other positive measures, including the extension of economic assistance to permit the upbuilding of the Middle Eastern nations, and more adequate provision for the refugees. To condition such economic assistance upon the agreements of the recipient nations

outlined above would seem, however, to be a reasonable, if not essential, requirement for our country to make in the interests of the peaceful upbuilding of those countries.

Congress should make it crystal clear that it will not allow the Eisenhower administration to give any nation in the Middle East a blank check to use our assistance for aggressions that are not specified in the resolution in its present form. We should let the nations of that region know that, above all, a peaceful settlement of their disputes with each other should be negotiated. Otherwise we are in grave danger of merely restoring the tinderbox which existed prior to October 29, 1956, and, indeed, by furnishing weapons to the Arab States, may actually increase the danger of war.

In fact, Mr. President, although the Secretary of State has not publicly announced what agreement he concluded with Saudi Arabia, it is nevertheless undoubtedly true, from the press dispatches, that a promise of military assistance of an undetermined but undoubtedly substantial sum was given to Saudi Arabia.

I think there is no doubt that the little state of Jordan will be next in the chow line, and will make a request for additional sums to support its army, to take the place of the British subvention which has been discontinued, and which will probably not be replaced by Saudi Arabia, Syria, and Egypt, despite their pledges.

Therefore, there may well be, in spite of the Eisenhower doctrine, if it is adopted, an increase in the military strength of the Arab States, which they may then use either against each other or against Israel, with the final result that we shall have made the possibility of war in the Middle East more certain and more bloody if it comes.

Mr. President, therefore, I submit an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 19, and request that it be printed and lie on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the desk; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

On page 6, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

"Sec. 4. In addition to the conditions of eligibility set forth in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, no military, economic, or technical assistance authorized pursuant to this resolution shall be supplied to any nation unless the recipient nation has made a binding agreement (a) not to commit any act of aggression upon any neighboring nation, (b) to submit all matters in controversy with neighboring nations to direct negotiations with such neighboring nations in a good faith effort to settle such controversies by mutual agreement, and failing agreement to submit the matters in dispute to arbitration, and (c) in the case of military assistance, not to use any such assistance except for self-defense within its own borders without the consent of the United States."

On page 6, line 7, strike out "4" and insert "5" and in line 10, strike out "5" and insert "6."

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the week shall have run I probably shall make some observations on the pending resolution. My purpose in rising today is to utter a few kind words in defense of the Secretary of State, if he needs any defense from me.

Contemporary opinion is a pretty cruel, captious, and unreasoning thing. Sometimes I think it is more than that. It is too often quite uninformed and purposeful, and sometimes it is vindictive.

When Buchanan was President of the United States it was written of him in an Ohio newspaper that he has stooped exceedingly low, even to the gutter that runs full of the filth of the lowest dregs of political abominations.

When Ulysses S. Grant was President of the United States it was written in the New York World on October 14, 1873, that—

It is a humiliation to the country that it has a Chief Magistrate who can put forth such a mess of crudities and contradictions with an oracular air of wisdom as if he were explaining important measures.

Still another publication of that day referred to the President and to the Cabinet as "merely phrase makers with far more gab than practical sense."

The Chicago Times was reported as saying, in the Grant administration, that the President's financial views could "scarcely be reconciled with a belief in his sanity."

The New York Graphic, on January 20, 1874, said:

There is not a first-rate statesman in the Cabinet.

The Detroit News, in November 1873, went a little further. It said it thought that "the classification of Cabinet members with mules was not altogether incongruous."

When Grover Cleveland was President, it was said of him, among other things, that he "is making the most scandalous exhibition ever made by a President."

On another occasion, the same newspaper said:

If the cant and hypocrisy were eliminated from him, he would collapse like a punctured balloon.

Still another publication said:

He thinks our Government is that of an absolute monarchy.

Still another publication said:

His theory of Government differs materially from that of the American Constitution and follows closely along the lines illustrated by the rule of Henry VIII and Elizabeth.

To make it wholly impersonal, on September 27, 1893, the New York Post said:

Does the Senate understand that at the present writing it is the most thoroughly despised body of public men in the world?

After Theodore Roosevelt became President, the Natchez (Miss.) Democrat of December 29, 1907, said of him that "he does not care a rap about law, proprieties, or precedent."

The New York Sun said:

A more conscienceless or reckless demagog never afflicted this country. His message

has been dismissed as the lucubration of a mind unhinged.

The Wall Street Journal, in a moment of charity, on March 4, 1908, said of the attacks on President Theodore Roosevelt that "the language of vilification has been exhausted in the attacks upon him."

Nor did Abraham Lincoln escape attack—and this is a good time to allude to it. He was referred to as "silly"; he was referred to as "ludicrous"; he was referred to as "a buffoon." One New York newspaper went so far as to say that Abraham Lincoln shared in the profits from Government contracts. Virtually every calumny which could be uttered was directed against this great American. So it is not surprising that an equally cruel attack should be made on John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State. In its sustained character it reminds me of the letter which Horace Greeley wrote to Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts in August of 1862. Greeley said:

Do you remember that old theological book containing this: "Chapter 1—Hell; Chapter 2—Hell Continued"? Well, that gives a hint of the way Old Abe ought to be talked to in this crisis of the Nation's destiny.

I think the illustration fits. For John Foster Dulles there has been a great deal of "hell," and "hell continued" in chapter 2. He was charged with being a liar and a deceiver, with wrongful action, with having hurt our allies and our relationships with our allies, with being influenced by the corporate oil connections of his former law firm, and with daily inconsistency. Either expressly or by implication, little has been left unsaid about him, all of which vindicates the thesis I uttered a little while ago when I said that contemporary opinion is a pretty cruel, brutal, pitiless thing.

What concerns me most is the effect of the attack in other lands, what good fuel this is for the flame.

I have had occasion to travel abroad a great deal. Whether it was in Africa or in Asia, whether it was in the Middle East or in Europe, not a day went by when there was not some glaring headline in a foreign newspaper reflecting that was said here in Washington, either in the Congress or elsewhere. What great and incandescent headlines some of the statements made. How much more tortuous and difficult is the road which must be traveled? How effective such attacks are in shattering our own unity and emotional harmony in a time of crisis.

Mr. President, there may be men in Government today who are moved by a greater spirit of dedication to a great cause, the cause of peace, than John Foster Dulles; but if there are, this Senator from Illinois has not yet seen them.

There may be people in Government gifted with greater constancy and unswerving devotion than Mr. Dulles; but if there are, I have not seen them, and I have been a Member of the legislative branch for more than 23 years.

There may be men with greater moral courage than Secretary Dulles—a courage which impelled him to scold and warn our closest allies against the pre-

cipitate action they took in the Middle East. That required moral courage. Mr. President, there may be men with greater moral courage than that possessed by Secretary Dulles, but I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government who are more willing to be broken and discarded in their unremitting pursuit of an ideal—the cause of amity and peace—than John Foster Dulles. But, if so, I have not seen them.

There may be men with a deeper recognition of what this country must do, rather than what some would like to have it do, and who, from that recognition, go steadily on and spend themselves in the cause. But if there are such people, I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government with a more lively appreciation of the inexorable fact that security, national freedom, and survival are the real challenges of our time, and that the choice before us is not so much war or peace, as it is victory or ruin. However, if there are people with a more sensitive appreciation of that fact than John Foster Dulles, I have not seen them.

There may be men in Government who have been in a more difficult position than Secretary Dulles in seeking to provide answers to questions day after day and day after day, and at the same time try to remain aware of the impact of their words on a dozen chancelleries abroad. But if there are such people, I have not encountered them.

There may be men in government with greater vision, with a broader outlook, and a great appreciation of the force of Lincoln's observation in the second annual message to Congress that "the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present." But if there be such men, I have not seen them.

So, Mr. President, I take this occasion to salute a devoted and capable public servant who has labored unremittingly to persuade peoples to live in peace, who has pursued the goal of moral and material strength abroad and unity at home, who has eschewed partisanship, who has never followed the multitude to do evil, and who, like a true statesman, thinks not merely of his own generation, but also of the next and the next and the next. That public servant is the incumbent Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TEXAS OIL PRODUCTION AT AN ALL-TIME HIGH

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, information has come to me from the UP News Service of an announcement in Austin, Tex., which I should like

to read into the RECORD for the information of Senators:

AUSTIN, TEX.—The Texas Railroad Commission boosted the State's oil production allowable for March to an alltime high of 3,733,054 barrels, an increase of 210,901 barrels per day.

The allowable is based on 18 producing days, up from 15 in February.

Representatives of most major oil companies had asked for 18 producing days, and told the State's oil regulatory body petroleum stocks range from satisfactory to dangerously low.

Some major spokesmen had urged 17 days.

Independent operators pressed their plea for further investigation by the Commission of what they called pipeline proration and lack of well connections, particularly in west Texas.

The Commission has scheduled hearings April 1 on allegations by five independent oil producers' groups that certain majors are throttling west Texas production so they can increase imports of foreign oil.

The giant east Texas field was put on the 18-day producing schedule, Pantex, 16, and Headlee-Devonian and Dora Roberts Devonian, 6 days each.

Mr. President, a distinguished member of that Commission, Lt. Gen. Ernest Thompson, telephoned a message to my office which states, in substance, as follows:

We raised the allowable this morning 210,901 barrels. This makes us an allowable of 3,733,054 barrels and to that add 536,854 barrels per day production of natural distillate and condensates. This is a total of 4,269,908 per day each and every day for March. In addition to that, your average buildup from new wells for the month will be around 25,000 to 30,000 barrels per day which makes a total increase of 210,901 barrels of crude from wells now in existence plus 25,000 to 30,000 barrels for new wells that will come in during March which will be about 250,000 barrels.

We are having a hearing on the 19th of March in Austin to which all of the chief executives of all of the major oil companies have been summoned to come. This is our regular procedure each March.

We are asking them to tell us how much oil they need for adequate working stock as of April 1 and November 1 on crude and all products.

We have done this historically.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the item the distinguished majority leader placed in the RECORD a moment ago brings to mind that an oil inquiry is under way, and has been for quite some time. The subject is so immense in its dimensions that I apprehend that sometimes we get lost in the machinery. I recited before the investigating committee, since I am a member of that committee, that it brought to mind a man with very modest habiliments who tried to get into a very fashionable church in New York, which has formally attired ushers, and that sort of thing. When he came out, he saw a friend who asked him how it was.

The man replied, "Well, I expect it is one of those places where God got lost in the machinery."

Sometimes it seems to me that the crux of a matter gets lost in the machinery.

Inasmuch as the distinguished majority leader has referred to an increase in oil production in the State of Texas, I thought this might be a good time to

sketch rather briefly for the record what is here involved.

Every Member of Congress has received inquiries as to why the price of oil has gone up. It is a very simple inquiry. Perhaps it ought to be simply answered, but there is no simple answer. I doubt whether anything has a simple answer any more. I recall a speech which was made by Charlie Taft, the brother of our late distinguished Bob Taft, before a federation in Washington, D. C. The first line of the speech was as follows: "Nothing will ever be simple again." That statement made me furious for a while, but I have an idea there is some truth in it.

So, Mr. President, there is nothing simple about this problem, because it is a highly complicated one which has ramifications all over the world.

Normally, we would not suspect that a canal 5,000 miles away would have any particular impact upon our own domestic well-being or the well-being of an entire continent. But it was in July that Colonel Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal, and it was in October that vessels were sunk in it and thus made it impossible for the canal to be used for transit purposes. On November 5 the pipeline which extends from Kiruk, in Iraq, across the Syrian desert, to a refinery in Tripoli, in the northern part of Lebanon, was dynamited. So all those events 5,000 miles away from home have suddenly set men, machinery, money, and brains into motion, in the hope that we can offset the rather evil effects of the series of problems which have arisen from that combination of events far away from our own shores.

First of all, Mr. President, we have the question of how to compensate for the loss of Middle East oil, insofar as Western Europe is concerned. Her daily need is 2 million barrels; that is her need when expressed in terms of industrial oil, domestic oil for heating purposes, and oil for other purposes. If there should be industrial collapse in Western Europe, obviously, that would have a tremendous impact upon the economy and well-being of the United States. So the first segment of the problem is how to "lift" oil to Europe.

The second segment is how to divert oil from Venezuela. Of course, the Caribbean area is rich in oil. Among the greatest proven oil reserves in the Western Hemisphere are those in northern Venezuela. The problem was how to divert oil from that area to Western Europe, and then how to compensate the east coast of our own country for the oil we normally derive from the Venezuelan Basin, for this is winter, and people get cold in winter; and in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and other parts of the United States fuel oil must be available if the people are to keep warm. The winter here has been a rather severe one. On the other hand, we can be grateful that in Western Europe the winter has been exceedingly mild.

So, Mr. President, first of all, we have the question of how to compensate for the loss of Middle East oil, because only about a trickle of oil goes around the African Cape and finally reaches the

places where oil from the Middle East had previously been used. However, that is only a minor facet of the problem.

The supply of oil coming to our own east coast has been shut off, and that situation causes a gap for which a supply must be obtained.

So we have the problem of the needs of our own east coast for oil, and also the problem of the needs of Europe for oil, and also the problem of the Suez Canal and when it will be open, when the expedition will finally raise the sunken vessels and make it possible for oil tankers to transit the canal.

In addition, there must be consent by someone to repair the pipeline which was dynamited. I suppose that when it was dynamited, the result was to turn off the valve on that supply of oil, and that was the end of it; and as a result there was a backing up of the oil which up to that time had been coming from the rich Iraqi Basin.

Finally, there is the question of the price of oil.

All these things put together constitute a problem which was being investigated by the Antimonopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. Something must be done in these premises. I shall not undertake to refine the problem. I assume that when these humble remarks of mine come to the attention of other Members of the Senate, they will be quick indeed to find any loopholes and any points of attack. That is perfectly all right, because I seek only to sketch the problem in its larger aspects.

Mr. President, in that situation something had to be done. Let us consider what was done in respect to all those aspects.

First of all, an expedition was sent to the canal, to raise and remove the sunken vessels. I was delighted when the expedition was put in charge of former Lieutenant General Wheeler, of the United States Army. He is a home boy; he comes from the county in Illinois where I live. He had much to do with the construction of the Burma Road. He is a great soldier and a great engineer in his own right. He has been making progress, and there is some hope that probably the canal will be renovated by March, so that oil tankers will be able once more to transit the canal and to ease somewhat the pressure which has been occasioned by the oil shortage.

Then there is the question of repairing the pipeline. I do not know precisely what will be done in that respect, or from whom consent must be obtained. But, after all, that situation is a part of the whole Middle East problem with which we are wrestling, and which at the present time engages the attention of the Congress.

Then there is the question of filling in the gap existing on our own east coast, because of the necessity of obtaining adequate supplies of fuel oil for use in the winter time. Because of that need, oil has been diverted from Venezuela to our east coast and also to Canada. Considerable fuss has been made about that; but it is a fact that oil has been diverted, and some Venezuelan oil has gone to Europe.

Then comes the larger problem of the oil lift. Great to-do has been made regarding whether we have achieved the target. In my judgment, what those who were in charge of the oil lift were expressing was a hope, rather than a daily target in terms of barrels of oil. It is easy to reach into thin air and get a figure, and to say that 500,000 barrels of oil are needed. Perhaps we can deliver 75 percent, 80 percent, or 90 percent; but at best that is a rather elusive hope or expectation, and many factors which may intrude may make it impossible to fulfill the hope.

The Middle East Emergency Committee, made up of 15 of the largest oil companies operating in the international field, was set up. Some of those companies are presently under a charge by the Department of Justice that they have violated the antitrust statutes. They have not been found guilty; as a matter of fact, they have not yet been tried on that charge. There is presently pending a docket for overcharges of the International Cooperation Administration for oil which was procured. I think it involves probably \$58 million or \$60 million. So eyebrows rise, and people ask, "How can oil companies which are operating in the international field, and which have billions of dollars of assets, be entrusted with the responsibility for operating an oil lift?"

Frankly, Mr. President, I do not know whom we could get, who would have the necessary talent, capacity, genius, and background, to do a job which involves Latin America and the Middle East and Western Europe and the production facilities of the United States. Certainly that job is not one for an amateur. Certainly it is not a job for limited vision and limited perspective. So those companies were brought into the picture, notwithstanding the criticisms which have been leveled. I do not comment now on the criticisms; they have been made, and they must stand for themselves.

In any event, the emergency committee was created; and it has been at work. The latest figure I have seen is that it has achieved the equivalent of approximately 478,000 barrels of oil a day. Probably that does not meet all of Western Europe's present needs, but it goes a long way toward doing so; and in view of the mild winter which Western Europe has experienced, there is not too much danger that suffering will occur among the free countries on the Continent of Europe, because of the present oil-supply situation.

In addition to all those problems, Mr. President, let me point out that there are problems which do not always readily meet the eye, but are related to the problems to which I have already referred. That consideration brings us to the item which was inserted in the RECORD by our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. President, the fact of the matter is that the Federal Government has no control over oil production; that is wholly within the jurisdiction of the States. That is why the State of Texas

has a commission, under the leadership of a very distinguished man, General Thompson, who for a great many years has been chairman of the Texas Railroad and Warehouse Commission. I see that there is indication that production has risen rather sharply; but the point I make first of all is that the production of petroleum is in the hands of the States, not the Federal Government. So the thing we have to do, of course, is to confer with the States.

Figures have been submitted to the committee to indicate that daily production has increased by 500,000 barrels. Some of that may have come out of inventories. All of it may come out of the earth in a single day. I am not sure I recall it accurately, but the testimony before the committee was that there was a 500,000-barrel increase in production in order to pick up the slack and meet the extra needs as a result of the Suez crisis and the shut-off of oil going from the Middle East to the Continent of Europe.

So that is one problem that does not meet the eye and which shows we must deal with the States.

Then we come to the question of distribution. How many tankers have been used, I do not know. Of course, oil companies have great fleets of tankers, some of them flying the American flag and some registered under the flags of other countries, like Panama. Certainly in the case of independent tanker owners who operate under charter-hire contracts, my understanding is that there is a provision in the contracts that in the event of hostilities they can charge a wartime rate. Immediately upon the invasion of Egypt, they began to increase tanker shipping costs. That has added somewhat to the cost of oil. That is another facet of the problem which is not always taken into account.

Next comes the import problem. There has been a struggle for years and years between the independent oil producers and the coal producers on one side and the major oil producers on the other with respect to the importation of Venezuelan oil, and particularly residual oil. It has had an impact on the price of coal. It has had a very decided impact on the oil industry in this country, for, in proportion as prices are held down and the producers cannot meet costs, it removes incentives to explore for new wells, in an attempt to keep ahead of the constantly increasing needs.

Our needs, Mr. President, are about 14 million barrels. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who is now in the Chair, comes from an oil-producing State. Our needs will increase. The census figures, indicated by the clock in the Department of Commerce, show that growth is the law of the country. We either vegetate or decay. We either grow or die. Of course, America grows, and we are up to a population of 170 million Americans. In the days ahead, that will mean more automobiles, more mechanization, and larger uses for petroleum and its derivatives.

So the wildcatting business has to go ahead. More and more oil resources must be found in this country. But it

is an inescapable fact, and I think the best geologists would so testify, that oil wells have to go deeper today. Whether the drilling is done in the State of Colorado, or in the State of Illinois, or in the State of New Mexico, or wherever it is done, drillers have to go deeper for oil sources today. That increases the cost. The costs of pipelines and labor have all gone up. So in connection with this whole matter, we must keep in mind that we must preserve the incentives.

The Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization testified in the hearings held on this question. He was ready to take action, when suddenly the Suez crisis developed, and he suspended all action. That was the testimony of Dr. Flemming before the committee.

So the import problem, the impact on our security, and the oil resources of this country in the future are all involved.

Then, of course, the price problem arises.

Mr. President, I am just as allergic to price rises as is anyone else. I can understand the letters and telegrams being sent to Members of the House and Senate by the people back home, but we should not lose sight of the one fact, when we seek to find some devil and whip him around the stump, that the most eminent geologist and producer in the State of Wyoming came before the committee and gave expert testimony indicating that the price of crude petroleum should go up 75 cents a barrel in order to return production costs on at least newly found wells. The only reason why producers have been able to operate is that they have been taking oil from wells found 15 and 20 years ago, when exploration costs were much cheaper, which compensates for the cost of taking oil from wells which have been drilled and explored more recently.

I do not know whether this is correct or not, but I understand that Mr. Curry was complimented by the distinguished chairman of the committee conducting the investigation as one of the outstanding men in the field. He came before the committee and stated there ought to be an increase in price in order to keep ahead and in order to provide the incentives so richly needed to keep us in the foreground.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator has gone into many items which enter into the picture and I should like to mention one other. Kansas is fifth in oil production. We are unable, because of a lack of pipeline and other facilities, to send oil to Europe. Therefore, it is essential to send oil for Europe from the coast. We would like to participate if we could, but we have a problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed so. That gives me an opportunity to indicate what the problem of the independent producer is. He is not integrated. In most cases he has no pipeline. He must sell his oil to the large, integrated companies. Whether the Humble Oil Co. posted a price increase I do not know because the president of the company has not been before the committee. He will ap-

pear before the committee next week, and he can speak for himself. However, I know what was testified by the independent producers in the case of those who represent the producers in my own State. Considerable oil is produced in southern Illinois and together with two neighboring States there has been formed a tri-State oil association. That association has been very free to send me information on this subject, and to tell what their immediate problems are with reference to oil production and prices.

I mention this to show that the problems do not readily meet the eye. There is the question of the oil lift, the question of Venezuelan oil, the question of the Middle East, the question of Europe, the welfare of our independent producers, how to get more oil within the jurisdictions of the States, the distribution problem, the price problem, the importation of residual oil, and a great many other problems.

So I end just where I started, with this thesis: When a Senator receives a telegram stating, "The price of oil has gone up. Who is to blame?" That is a very simple question, but at the moment there is not a very simple answer. I sincerely hope the committee, under the expert guidance of a very distinguished Member of the Senate, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who made such a superb and gracious chairman, will get all the answers, and probably some substantive proposals can be recommended which will fit in with our economy and with the general American concept, and still take care of the problems that are before us.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAVITS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in accordance with the majority leader's suggestion and pursuant to the order heretofore entered, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 20, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 18), 1957:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States circuit judge, fourth circuit, vice Armistead M. Dobie, retired.

PROMOTIONS IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to be captains in the United States Coast Guard:

Richard D. Schmidt	John P. German
man	Joseph B. Feder
John T. Stanley	Oscar C. Rohnke
James D. Craik	Karl O. A. Zittel
Anthony J. DeJoy	Gilbert I. Lynch
Loren H. Seeger	George R. Leslie
George D. Synon	Albert A. Lawrence
Irvin J. Stephens	Jerry B. Hoag
Donald T. Adams	Joseph A. Bresnan
Theodore J. Fabik	Carl H. Stober
Reinhold R. Johnson	John R. Kurcheski
Hollis M. Warner	Frederick G. Wild
Walter B. Millington	

The following-named persons to be commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Benjamin M. Chiswell	Kingdrel N. Ayers
Jr.	Victor A. G. Schmidt
Joe L. Horne	Elmer A. Crock
Helmer S. Pearson	James A. Palmer
Donald M. Morell	Bernhard R. Henry
Robert D. Brodie IV	Robert C. Gould
Peter Olsen	Raphael T. A. McKenzie
Robert E. Reed-Hill	Ernest D. Murray
Ernest M. Espelle	Peter Madison
Chester A. Richmond	Alfred M. Haynes
Jr.	David H. Douglas
James M. McLaughlin	Wilber S. Doe
Henry F. Rohrkemper	John L. Barron
Charles F. Scharfenstein, Jr.	William E. Ehrman
Robert P. Cromwell	Gordon H. MacLane
Kenneth R. Goodwin	William J. L. Parker
James W. Kincaid	

The following-named persons to be lieutenant commanders in the United States Coast Guard:

Burton V. Weston, Jr.	Jay P. Dayton
Manson E. Meekins	Richard H. Hagadorn
Gordon L. Bates	Robert J. Carson
Carleton W. Wahl	Hugh C. McCaffrey
Walter J. Felton	Merle L. Harbourn
Leonard A. Wardlaw	Edwin W. Coleman
Jr.	Robert D. Fuller
Bruce H. Jensen	Robert S. Capp
Caleb M. Sickles	Leslie F. Cool
David Block	John D. Roberts
Harold J. McCormack	Raymond J. Evans
Earl B. Cooper	Scott P. Berryman
Rayner C. Burke	Willis G. Partridge
William H. Monger	William G. Blandford
Joseph E. Gould	Albert G. Jones
Robert W. Smith	Stanley G. Perret
James P. Flessas	John R. Allums
Robert A. Adamson	Norman E. Dion
David Gershowitz	Daniel J. Garrett
Dono W. Moore	William A.
Eric G. Grundy	Montgomery

The following-named persons to be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard:

Charles W. Lockwood	John A. Flynn
Dudley C. Goodwin, Jr.	Neal E. Williams, Jr.
Arthur E. Lawrence, Jr.	Frank L. Shelley
Ralph B. Pruett	William T. Adams II
Benjamin F. Rush	Arne J. Soreng
Harry J. Gardner, Jr.	David F. Lauth
Walter Folger	William H. Stewart
Frederick O. Wooley	Charles E. Larkin, Jr.
Lyle W. Lemos	Henry A. Cretella
Frederick W. Folger	Donald B. Russell
John V. Caffrey	William S. Schwob, Jr.
Karl F. Peterson	Anthony F. Fugaro
John E. Wesler	Reginald W. Raynor, Jr.
William R. Fearn	Norman B. Binns
Laurence J. Hoch	Harold A. Paulsen
James S. Gracey	Richard S. Dolliver
Richard T. Penn, Jr.	Sidney A. Wallace
Charles L. Blaha	Jules B. DuPeza
Thomas E. Hawkins	Joseph W. E. Ward
Ernest R. Tindle	Robert Schuerch, Jr.

Herbert M. Hartlove	Harry H. Keller, Jr.
Nicholas Ivanovsky	Wilfred H. Shaw
Herbert H. Mulvany	Paul W. Meyer
Royce A. Lewis	

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-4, in the United States Coast Guard:

Peter J. Byrne	Arnold H. Peterson
Harry H. Eckels	Robert P. Chirnside
Ezekiel D. J. Fulcher	Toivo R. Juntunen
Henry C. Wear, Jr.	Herbert E. Mister
Clarence J. Pare, Jr.	John Atherton
Melvin Handley	Milo A. Jordan
Maurice L. Kambarn	Rene J. Chevrier
Robert C. Preston	Joseph Etienne
Albert H. Hauser	James A. Hadley
George E. Cote	Royce O. Tackett
Norman A. Cooper	Lowell D. Mead
Carl D. Miller	Wilber E. Harris
Ralph C. Sidebottom	Benjamin F. Lombard
Donald T. Cook	Samuel R. Randolph
William O. Adams	

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-3, in the United States Coast Guard:

Hugh S. Hanna	William H. Mattson
Richard V. Bercaw	Anthony F. Glaza, Jr.
John F. Malley	George H. Jenks
Joseph N. Alewine	Finis C. Key
Peter P. Ashton	Franklin H. Wix
Peter D. Shost	Milton L. Black
Lavine Hubert	Gentry J. Cooke
Eugene P. Farley	Harold G. Welchert
Eugene C. Colson	William H. Magowan
Joseph M. Donovan	Phillip M. Collins
Escol J. Parker	Milo A. Cornelius
Joseph C. Daniels	James J. Morsey
William H. Reed	Frank L. Ryman, Jr.
Harry A. Lessey	Ernest B. Fuller
Alfred R. Marsh	William R. Jenkins

The following-named persons to be chief warrant officers, W-2, in the United States Coast Guard:

George H. Corston	Thomas J. Hushion
Arnold A. Adams	Robert Malaussena
John A. Flynn	Charles E. Holden
Alfred A. Kolb	Earl A. Boles
Emmett Gossen	James M. Mauldin
Charles R. Smith	Marvin E. Ginn
Frank M. Miller, Jr.	Gustave F. Scholz
John J. Gunson	Norman L. Cates
Albert L. Lingenfelter	Anthony H. Halko
Arthur F. Myers	Raymond W. Trevett
William H. Hudson	Charles W. Griffiths
George F. Weadon	James C. Rosemergy
Frank Bartling	Charles H. Agee
Mitchel K. Opsitnik	Henry T. Hutchins
Raymond W. Olson	Thomas E. Hurt
George F. W. Ehrsam	Harold S. Winther
Roy E. Needles	Albert Solberg
Warren G. Tubbs	Raymond J. White
Herbert L. Simpson	Burton B. Watkins
Wallace E. Hulteen	Charles J. Volpe, Jr.
Harold E. DeYoung	Dominic G. Swider
George R. Peck	Herman J. Lentz
William T. Dickinson	John C. Horton
Starr C. Burgess	William O. Gaverly
Harold A. C. DuChene	Richard R. Spencer
Frank B. Wright	Frank E. Smith
Michael O'Connell	Thurman T. Cook
David F. Ray	Curtis J. Olds
Claude A. Robinson	Joseph W. Ellis
Herbert S. Lyman	Wendell M. Cahill
Paul Schuttpeitz, Jr.	Joseph A. Yeager
James P. Avila	Lyle E. Cable
Maltire N. O'Neal	James A. Wooley
Fred A. Shabo	John H. Forbing
Frank H. Monty	Dewey H. Scarborough, Jr.
George Mathews	Phillip M. Griebel
Walter F. Shepich	Seymour Alexander
Randall H. Spooner	Robert J. Hanson
Harold W. Collins	Harold Eveld
Herbert L. Gordon	Walter P. Stipich
Raymond L. Williams	James R. Kane